

COMMITTEE ON  
UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

---

ANNUAL REPORT  
FOR THE YEAR 1967  
(90th Congress, 1st Session)



OCTOBER 1, 1968.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House  
on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Prepared and released by the Committee on Un-American Activities  
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

---

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

20-206 O

WASHINGTON : 1968

**COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES**

**UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**(90th Congress, 1st Session, 1967)**

**EDWIN E. WILLIS, Louisiana, *Chairman***

**WILLIAM M. TUOK, Virginia**

**JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio**

**JOE R. POOL, Texas**

**DEL OLAWSON, California**

**RICHARD H. ICHORD, Missouri**

**RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH, Indiana**

**JOHN C. CULVER, Iowa**

**ALBERT W. WATSON, South Carolina**

**FRANCIS J. MCNAMARA, *Director***

**CHESTER D. SMITH, *General Counsel***

**ALFRED M. NITTE, *Counsel***

**(II)**

# CONTENTS

---

	<b>Page</b>
Foreword.....	1
Chapter I. Hearings Conducted for Legislative Purposes:	
Investigative Hearings on Espionage Activities within the United States.....	3
Legislative Hearings on Bills To Amend the Internal Security Act of 1950.....	18
The New Communist Propaganda Line on Religion—Testimony of Rev. Richard Wurmbrand.....	30
Investigative Hearings on Subversive Influences in Riots, Looting, and Burning, Parts 1, 2, and 3.....	35
Investigative Hearings on Communist Activities in the Central California Area.....	63
Chapter II. Reports Compiled To Assist the Congress in Its Legislative Deliberations:	
Preliminary Inquiry into the American Nazi Party.....	75
Communist Origin and Manipulation of Vietnam Week (April 8-15, 1967).....	78
Vietnam Week Postscript.....	87
The Present-Day Ku Klux Klan Movement.....	89
Chapter III. Reference Service for Members of Congress.....	93
Chapter IV. Bibliography of Committee Publications for the Year 1967.....	94
Chapter V. Contempt Proceedings.....	96
Chapter VI. Legislative Recommendations.....	98
Index.....	i

The House Committee on Un-American Activities is a standing committee of the House of Representatives, constituted as such by the rules of the House, adopted pursuant to Article I, section 5, of the Constitution of the United States which authorizes the House to determine the rules of its proceedings.

## RULES ADOPTED BY THE 90TH CONGRESS

HOUSE RESOLUTION 7, JANUARY 10, 1967

### RESOLUTION

*Resolved*, That the Rules of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-ninth Congress, together with all applicable provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, be, and they are hereby, adopted as the Rules of the House of Representatives of the Ninetieth Congress \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

### RULE X

#### STANDING COMMITTEES

1. There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress,

\* \* \* \* \*

(r) Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine Members.

\* \* \* \* \*

### RULE XI

#### POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

\* \* \* \* \*

18. Committee on Un-American Activities.

(a) Un-American activities.

(b) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

\* \* \* \* \*

27. To assist the House in appraising the administration of the laws and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary, each standing committee of the House shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee; and, for that purpose, shall study all pertinent reports and data submitted to the House by the agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

\* \* \* \* \*



## LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

---

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,  
*Washington, October 1, 1968.*

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,  
*The Speaker,*  
*U.S. House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to House Resolution 7, 90th Congress, 1st session, and by direction of the committee, I herewith transmit the Annual Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities for the year 1967 (90th Congress, 1st session).

Sincerely yours,

EDWIN E. WILLIS,  
*Chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities.*



---

---

# Union Calendar No. 817

90TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT  
2d Session } No. 1935

---

---

## COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES ANNUAL REPORT FOR THE YEAR 1967

---

OCTOBER 1, 1968.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State  
of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

Mr. WILLIS, from the Committee on Un-American Activities,  
submitted the following

### REPORT

[Pursuant to H. Res. 7, 90th Cong., 1st sess.]



## FOREWORD

A quick glance at the general contents of this report reveals how numerous the enemies of freedom and democracy are and the importance of adequate security measures.

During the year 1967 the committee developed and reported to the Congress information about Nazis, Ku Klux Klans, and black racist revolutionary organizations. In the area of communism it developed information on such widely divergent topics as Soviet espionage; Communist efforts to influence and win the cooperation of churches; Com-

U.S. foreign policy, there is a break in our security that neither the FBI, the CIA, this committee, nor any other security agency can repair.

When religious leaders, editors, and political candidates recommend that this Nation abandon millions to the untender mercies of Communist mass murderers, the very concept of democracy is discredited and the rights of every American weakened.

Other examples could be cited of cultural gaps which offset effective work by security agencies and which these agencies cannot repair.

The people of this country have for years been rightly concerned with many of the more practical and immediate aspects of security—the operations and effectiveness of various agencies, programs, and so forth. This has been good as far as it has gone, but evidence today indicates that it has not gone quite far enough.

What is needed more than anything else is attention—much more attention—to the basic cultural elements in security which are completely independent of our country's security agencies and without which their work will ultimately be as useful as tilting at windmills.

No nation has known security when its cultural media, because of a confused, muddleheaded concept of "broadmindedness," "tolerance," and "freedom," have been devoted to a significant degree—as some in America are today—to hypercritical denigration of its institutions, leadership and policies, while excusing, justifying, or actually defending those of its enemies.

Our cultural media, ranging from the home through the church to the latest political speech and the press and TV commentary on it, can do more to protect the Nation than any Government security agency, or combination of such agencies—provided they are utilized to educate the American people in the conviction and faith that ours is the best of all forms of government and that, despite its faults and foibles, it is eminently worth preserving at all costs.

The only secure people in the world are those with such a conviction. Security entails much more than establishing agencies and appropriating money for their operations. It demands conviction, belief, and faith—and the hardheadedness to see that the preservation of freedom demands continuing contribution to our country, combined with continuing, unremitting—and informed—struggle against its enemies.

EDWIN E. WILLIS, *Chairman.*

# ANNUAL REPORT FOR THE YEAR 1967

## CHAPTER I

### HEARINGS CONDUCTED FOR LEGISLATIVE PURPOSES

#### INVESTIGATIVE HEARINGS ON ESPIONAGE ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE UNITED STATES

On April 6 and 7, May 10, June 15, and November 15, 1967, a subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities held public investigative hearings in Washington, D.C., on espionage activities within the United States by agents of foreign Communist governments. The hearings also concerned the techniques used by Communist-bloc agents to obtain the cooperation of American citizens in their intelligence-collecting operations.

The subcommittee, appointed by Chairman Edwin E. Willis, was composed of the following members, in addition to himself: Hon. William M. Tuck (D-Va.), chairman, Hon. John C. Culver (D-Iowa), Hon. Richard L. Roudebush (R-Ind.), and Hon. Albert W. Watson (R-S.C.). These hearings were held, pursuant to a committee resolution of March 8, 1967, to provide "factual information to aid the Congress in the enactment of any necessary remedial legislation."

#### TESTIMONY OF JOHN HUMINIK, JR.

(APRIL 6 AND 7, 1967)

Mr. John Huminik, Jr., 31, after being sworn, gave his birthplace as Washington, D.C. Mr. Huminik testified to the following facts:

He received his early education in the District of Columbia and he subsequently attended various technical institutes and military schools, as well as completing many correspondence courses from which he received diplomas and certificates in machine design, metallurgy, industrial metallurgy, aircraft structural maintenance, and aircraft materials.

A scientist and businessman by profession, he has been associated with the defense industry in and around Washington, D.C., in the capacity of engineer, scientist, and corporation officer. He is presently a consultant on metallurgical and welding technology, as well as chairman of the board of Chemprox Corporation, a small chemical manufacturing company.

The witness has written a technical text dealing with rocket reentry coatings and high temperature materials related to space and rocketry programs entitled *High Temperature Inorganic Coatings*, plus innumerable technical papers. He has also been a member of several technical societies, including the American Ordnance Association, American Society for Metals, American Welding Society, and the

Inter-American Relations Committee of the American Society for Metals.

Mr. Huminik served as chairman of the Washington chapter of the American Society for Metals (1965-66) and of the American Welding Society (1961-62), was awarded the Welding Society's meritorious certificate in 1963, and was listed in *Who's Who in Commerce and Industry* (13th edition).

In the past, Mr. Huminik has held positions with a number of companies in the Washington, D.C., area, such as head of metallurgical group, Melpar, Inc.; vice president and senior scientist, Value Engineering Company; and manager, Materials Engineering Department, Fairchild Hiller Corporation.

Mr. Huminik was honorably discharged from the Military Reserves after 12 years of both active and reserve duty. Attached to the U.S. Army Chemical Corps, he received a commission in the Chemical Corps Reserves and commanded the 312th Chemical Company and the 419th Chemical Biological and Radiological Center. He also completed a 2-year Chemical Officer Career Course.

In 1961 Mr. Huminik became a voluntary, unpaid operative working under the guidance of the FBI against Soviet diplomats who were conducting espionage operations out of the Soviet Embassy and consulate in Washington.

The witness told the subcommittee of his chance meeting with Aleksandr Izvekov, a Russian diplomat who gave the witness and his visiting relatives a personal tour of the Soviet Embassy in 1960. Later, an associate of Izvekov, Dr. Sergei Stupar, applied for membership in the American Society for Metals, of which Mr. Huminik was secretary.

The witness, of Russian ancestry, suspected the two Soviet diplomats of trying to utilize their new-found friendship with him as a means of gleaning highly technical data in the field of metallurgy. At an early point in his contacts with the Russians, Mr. Huminik sought the advice of the FBI. He agreed to work hand in hand with the Bureau to uncover the clandestine espionage activities of a highly trained Soviet spy ring.

Dr. Stupar was admitted to membership in the American Society for Metals, a large society representing 20 countries with a membership of 35,000 in this country, and told Mr. Huminik that he was a "scientist and not interested in politics."

Through his acquaintance with Dr. Stupar, the witness was introduced to Anatole Kuznetsov, a third secretary of the Soviet Embassy, and Vladimir Boutenko, the assistant commercial consular, who also received membership in the American Society for Metals. Boutenko was extremely interested in the society and "took copious notes" and "made contact with as many ASM members as he could" at its meetings, according to the witness.

Vladimir Boutenko offered the witness a "trade agreement" with Chemprox Corporation, Mr. Huminik's company, and stated that if he "cooperated with the diplomats they would get \* \* \* [him] some nice trade agreements with the Soviet Union."

Boutenko gave the witness several gifts in the process of their relationship: diaries, perfume, address books, chemical catalogs, calendars, and vodka.

Another third secretary of the Soviet Embassy, Vladimir Zorov, attended a meeting of the American Society for Metals with Boutenko.



The witness told the subcommittee that Zorov stated to him: "Mr. Huminik, we would be glad to pay very good prices for any information that you could give to our government." Zorov, however, added a solemn warning: "We take care of our friends and we also take care of our enemies."

The witness surmised that both the civilian (KGB) and military (GRU) intelligence agencies of the Soviet Union were represented in the operation through the various Soviet officials with whom he made contact. He said the two Soviet intelligence organizations appeared to be vying with each other for his services and, thereby, the classified information they hoped to obtain through him.

Mr. Huminik told of still another contact with Soviet intelligence in the person of Aleksy R. Malinin, the assistant commercial consular at the Soviet consulate at that time. Malinin, declared persona non grata by this country in 1966, posed as a welding expert and was involved with U.S. Air Force Sergeant Herbert W. Boeckenhaupt in still another espionage operation, not related to Huminik's. (Boeckenhaupt was later convicted of conspiring with Aleksy Malinin to steal U.S. codes and communications data.) Huminik's chance encounter with Malinin took place at an American Welding Society meeting in 1964.

Another of the witness' many contacts was Valentin Revin, who was the assistant scientific consular of the Soviet Embassy and a successor to Dr. Stupar. Mr. Huminik stated that Revin, a very intelligent, alert, well-spoken, and thoroughly Westernized Soviet official, was very close to himself in mannerisms, temperament, and even age, build, and stature. The witness believed that through Revin the Embassy was attempting to "match an intelligence agent" with the person to be exploited.

Revin gave Mr. Huminik several gifts, including a \$180 Omega wristwatch and vodka.

The witness gave his personal views as to why the Soviets would choose him as a "target," stating his Russian ancestry, his being an officer in the American Society for Metals, his personal accessibility, his access to Government officials and reports, and his extensive research into and knowledge of "reentry coatings" on satellites and rockets, all of which, combined, made him a very desirable subject to cultivate for critical intelligence information.

After stating that all the Soviet agents he had had contact with had either left this country or been declared persona non grata, he noted that his "assessment period" by the Soviets had taken a full 4 years "before they really got down to business." During this 4-year period the Soviets attempted various means of gaining control over the witness: (1) by telling him that they had located relatives of his in Russia (Georgia); (2) by obtaining from him handwritten reports bearing his signature which presumably could be used later for blackmail purposes; (3) by having him perform minor intelligence-type assignments.

In 1964 Boutenko asked the witness to obtain all information necessary to become "employed in the United States Government." The agent wanted not only Government Form 57, but all other documents and information pertinent to application for Government employment. The witness deduced that, armed with the proper information, the Soviets might conceivably attempt to place one or more of their people in U.S. Government jobs.

The Soviet agents also asked Huminik to obtain copies of all papers necessary to establish a corporation in the U.S. and asked if he would be willing to employ a Soviet in his chemical firm, both of which, of course, would facilitate their establishing cover for "illegals."

Dr. Stupar made a direct approach to the witness asking for data on industrial machines, chemicals, blueprints, and other technical subjects. The industrial equipment was unidentifiable in the public hearing and, while not Government restricted, would not be sold to a foreign power. At this point the Soviet agents were prepared to have the witness commit a felony by either stealing the device or making a scale drawing of it. The chemicals the Soviets wanted were used in manufacturing a high-grade steel and were unavailable in Russia or her satellites. For reasons of national security the witness could not identify the rocketry materials the Soviet agents were interested in obtaining. The witness was told that his cooperation in obtaining the items desired would merit him a forged passport, escape route, and an excellent job in Russia should the FBI become aware of his activities. If all went well, he would be rewarded with trade agreements and money.

Mr. Huminik stated to the subcommittee that his contact with the Soviet agents turned to a full-scale clandestine operation on March 22, 1965, when Valentin Revin first met with the witness at his home. Revin incorporated in the operation the use of danger signals, alternate plans, and a system of "dead drops" (places of concealment where objects can be deposited and later picked up by another person), escape plans and "live passes" (objects or information passed directly from one person to another). Various means of contacts were all prearranged in successive meetings with Revin.

The witness gave several elaborate examples of "dead drops" and "live passes" that actually had taken place between him and Revin.

Mr. Huminik told of the special camera the Soviet agents gave him \$300 cash to purchase. The camera was designed especially to photograph documents and was outfitted with a closeup lens. He was also instructed to buy a special brand of high-speed film for use in photographing documents with ordinary light.

The Soviet agents provided the witness with additional money to buy a tape recorder and instructed him to recapitulate entire conversations which he held with various scientists and defense officials known to him in the Pentagon.

Mr. Huminik revealed that over the 51½ years he worked under FBI guidance he made approximately 75 personal contacts with Soviet agents. The Soviets, he declared, were primarily interested in scientific and engineering reports. The witness conjectured that the reason for the demand for this information was an apparent Soviet lack of the superior technology that is abundant in this country. He added:

They don't need to know troop movements and things like this as the espionage people did during World War II. They want technology, new weapons, faster airplanes, rockets, things like this. They wanted proprietary industrial processes \* \* \*. They wanted details \* \* \*.

They also wanted machines, rocket propellants, things on the Surveyor Moon Program, information concerning weapons, and "background information on scientists, specific scientists, and they wanted proprietary chemicals also."

In a warning to the American people, Mr. Huminik said:

My personal lesson indicates to me that there is danger to the small businessman, the scientist, and the engineer. The Soviets want technology more than anything else, and it is their plan to get it from technical people. \* \* \*

The witness offered a special word of caution to technical people of Slavic descent whom the Soviets feel will be more susceptible to their approach.

Mr. Huminik then stated:

They will use money, promises of business, and many other ploys to entice Americans to work for them. They often strive to achieve such a firm grip on an individual that he would be afraid to go to the FBI \* \* \*

The Soviets proved to me that they will penetrate our country as far as possible and by any means. \* \* \*

In his statement, the witness added, "The Soviet Union has not changed its policy regarding espionage in this country for at least the last 20 years \* \* \*."

Mr. Huminik read from two articles which had been printed in *Izvestia*, official newspaper of the Soviet Government, which made derogatory allegations about him and said that American press accounts of espionage by Soviet Embassy officials were merely "anti-Soviet slander campaigns."

At the close of his testimony, Mr. Huminik indicated his personal agreement with earlier statements of the FBI to the effect that 80 to 85 percent of the Soviet diplomats are engaged in intelligence and espionage operations.

#### TESTIMONY OF LEONARD I. EPSTEIN

(MAY 10, 1967)

Leonard I. Epstein, 40, of Paramus, N.J., was sworn in and gave his birthplace as New York City. Mr. Epstein is vice president and sales engineer of Trans-American Machinery and Equipment Corporation, a firm engaged in the purchasing, rebuilding, and resale of surplus machinery and machine tools.

Mr. Epstein is a graduate engineer of Case Institute of Technology in Cleveland, Ohio. After college graduation he went into the armed services and after discharge from the Army worked for Chance Vought Aircraft in Stratford, Conn.; Stone and Webster Engineering in Baton Rouge, La.; Fluor Corporation in Houston, Tex.; and the Red River Arsenal, U.S. Army Arsenal at Texarkana, Tex.

Upon leaving the Red River Arsenal, Mr. Epstein attended Stevens Institute of Technology in Hoboken, N.J., under the G.I. bill. After completing his studies at Stevens Institute he was employed with the U.S. Naval Research Laboratories at Bayonne, N.J.

Mr. Epstein entered the machinery business in 1953 after leaving the U.S. Naval Research Laboratories and was employed by S and S Machinery, Johnson Machinery, and Jem Machinery. He formed his own corporation in 1956 and went into business with Mr. George Yohrling. His business, Trans-American Machinery and Equipment Corporation, is located at 27 East 23d Street, Paterson, N.J.

Leonard Epstein is a member of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, as well as a past member of both the Society of Automotive Engineers and the American Society for Metals. He is a vice

president of the Case Alumni Association, New York chapter, and a past commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States in his hometown.

Mr. Epstein told the subcommittee that his partner, George Yohrling, was, as himself, involved in all the details of the various contacts made with a Russian United Nations employee. He then gave the subcommittee a brief background of his partner:

Mr. Yohrling is 49 years old. \* \* \* He has been in the machinery business \* \* \* approximately 30 years. He is \* \* \* an ex-tool and die maker that got into rebuilding and finally into machinery purchases.

He is also a former U.S. paratrooper, and he holds a Silver Star for gallantry. \* \* \*

Mr. Epstein related the nature of his business as buying and selling machine tools for rebuilding and retrofitting. Machines, primarily purchased from Government and private surplus sales, were updated and sold for a profit.

The witness said that in his half-million-dollar-a-year business machine tool and other equipment purchases were usually made on a bid basis, with sale going to the highest competitive bidder.

Mr. Epstein, in his testimony, said that equipment can be purchased from the Atomic Energy Commission, from the Navy Department, and from other military departments. The material is usually "screened" and is demilitarized by the buyer or seller prior to resale.

While there is evidently no restriction of resale, the witness added, there are definite restrictions "as to what you can ship overseas and to what nations."

Saying that U.S. machine tool and other equipment is at least 20 to 40 years ahead of the rest of the world, Mr. Epstein spoke briefly of his recent trip to a machine tool show in Chicago where the Soviet Union exhibited a piece of equipment that manufacturers in the U.S. stopped making 40 years ago. He added that American equipment such as the type bought and sold by his firm "is of very definite interest to foreign countries, whether friendly or unfriendly."

The witness was asked if he ever knew a person named Vadim Isakov. He told the subcommittee that Isakov was a Russian employee of the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF), in the position of procurement officer. (Isakov came to the U.S. in 1962.)

Mr. Epstein first met Isakov through a neighbor who was selling hospital and laboratory equipment to UNICEF. Isakov had asked Mr. Epstein's neighbor for the name of someone who handled technological equipment.

Vadim Isakov called the witness and said he was interested in obtaining technological equipment for underdeveloped countries. On July 15, 1965, Mr. Epstein and Mr. Yohrling made an appointment with Isakov at the United Nations building in New York City.

At the first meeting, the procurement officer wanted to buy laboratory supplies. The witness and his partner told Isakov that they did not handle this type of equipment and instead offered him an entire surplus plant for the manufacture of watch parts. The Russian did not seem interested, but stated that he would like to visit Mr. Epstein's plant in Paterson, N.J.

On his first visit to the plant, Isakov was very interested in a surplus missile computer and asked for the nomenclature of the model. Addi-

tionally, Isakov produced a list from which he proceeded to read the descriptions of four items which he noted could be sold to a "customer" of his in Europe. The items included: (1) an underwater robot made by Vare Industries, which is designed to explore the bottom of the ocean. Cost, over \$300,000; (2) an accelerometer made by American Bosch Arma Corporation or similar company. The accelerometer is an intricate device which measures the pull of gravity on any vehicle such as a missile or space-orbiting device. The device costs about \$6,000; (3) a miniature computer, valued at \$45,000, said to be manufactured by Sperry Gyroscope. The computer was to be small and compact enough to be carried on board a missile or rocket (upon subsequent investigation, the witness found that Sperry Gyroscope never manufactured any such device); and finally (4) a quantity of titanium pressure vessels. Mr. Epstein called a well-known manufacturer of pressure vessels and asked about a 9,000 p.s.i. vessel. When told that the company would be happy to sell the vessels which were made of steel, Isakov stated, "No, no. It must be light, it is going to go up."

Isakov stated that upon delivery of these items the witness and his partner would be paid in cash. Furthermore, the high cost of the items did not seem to bother the Russian at all.

After the first plant meeting with Isakov, Mr. Epstein, now suspicious, contacted a neighbor who was an FBI employee and related the entire story to him. The following week FBI agents instructed Mr. Epstein and his partner to "lead the man on" and "find out what he wanted."

Between the second and third meeting with Isakov, the Russian had taken a trip out of the country. Upon his return, he called Mr. Epstein and stated that the miniature computer he wanted was not manufactured by Sperry Gyroscope, but was instead a "Red Man" minicomputer made by IBM. Likewise, he was now familiar with many of the technical requirements concerning the four items, knowledge of which he had lacked on his first visit.

In October of 1965, Isakov began to push for delivery on the accelerometers. The witness surmised that the urgency had something to do with the fact that the Soviets had smashed three vehicles onto the surface of the moon.

That same month the U.S. Government began putting various types of missile sites up for sale. Isakov had received previous information regarding the sales and was most interested in obtaining a brochure on the sites.

The witness told the subcommittee how he "stalled" Isakov for "quite some time" on the purchase of the accelerometers, by telling the Russian that the company had run out of stock and had to go completely through the manufacturing process which, because of the delicate nature of the instrument, would take from 60 to 90 days.

Mr. Epstein recounted the incident which led to his discovery, "quite by accident," that the accelerometers were indeed classified. The witness had walked into a surplus electronics store and simply asked if they had the device in stock. After finding two of the instruments on a shelf in the back of the store, the witness asked the clerk to call the manufacturer and check the characteristics. The clerk called in the presence of the witness. The company was shocked that the store had obtained the devices and immediately sent an armed guard to retrieve them.

The Russian became quite anxious to obtain an accelerometer and set up a clandestine meeting at a shopping center for the transaction. The witness called the FBI and was told to simply avoid the meeting with Isakov. Mr. Epstein explained his missing the contact to Isakov with the pretext that he had been out of town on business and that they had not yet received shipment of the device as scheduled.

At this point in the relationship, the Russian would no longer come to the New Jersey plant for meetings, believing he would become too well known to the plant employees. A second meeting was set up at a restaurant near the plant, at which Isakov attempted to have the witness ship the device overseas for him. When Mr. Epstein refused, the Russian said that it did not matter, as he would "get it out in a diplomatic pouch." The witness asked the UNICEF procurement officer how he was going to get the underwater robot out of the country. The answer was the same, "under diplomatic pouch," although, in his position, he had no diplomatic standing.

One of the final meetings the witness had with the Russian had to do with an item that was included in the sealed-bid package on the missile sites which were offered for sale and took place on December 4, 1965. Isakov requested Mr. Epstein to purchase a device from the missile site called a Sylphon bellows. The item was described as a flexible connector used to fuel missiles just prior to launching. The witness attributed the impetus of the Russian's desire to purchase this particular device to probable difficulty with Soviet missile fueling techniques. The Sylphon bellows, like the other items, was never delivered to Isakov.

The witness told the subcommittee that he had had 20 different contacts with the UNICEF procurement officer—10 in person and 10 by telephone—from July 1965 to December of that same year.

On January 12, 1966, a newspaper broke the story of the clandestine operation being conducted by Isakov out of the U.N. and brought an end to the case. Two weeks later, on January 22, Vadim Isakov resigned his post after a State Department protest which stated he was involved in activities not in keeping with his U.N. position.

In his closing statements to the subcommittee, Mr. Epstein told of the apparent critical need which exists in the Soviet Union for U.S. advanced technology. He stated his objections to our giving up our advances for the sake of a few dollars' profit. The witness stressed that he was not talking about military secrets, but rather our technological secrets.

Mr. Epstein was of the opinion that the proposed opening of additional Soviet consulates in this country would create further problems for the U.S. with reference to technological espionage. He also saw the need for tighter controls on classified or advanced surplus material sales by the armed services in screening certain items destined for disposition on the open market.

#### TESTIMONY OF FRANK JOHN MRKVA

(JUNE 15, 1967)

Mr. Frank John Mrkva, 39, chief of the Field Service Branch, Domestic Operations, Passport Office of the U.S. Department of State, was born in Beaver Falls, Pa., and currently resides in Lanham, Md.

Mr. Mrkva attended high school in Beaver Falls, graduating in 1947. He graduated from Garfield Business Institute in Beaver Falls in 1949 and was subsequently employed there by the Babcock and Wilcox Tube Company; the Jones and Laughlin Steel Company of Aliquippa, Pa.; and by Michael Baker, Jr., a land surveyor and consulting engineer in Rochester, Pa. He was also employed with Wilco Builders, working on the Ohio Turnpike.

Mr. Mrkva entered the U.S. Army in December of 1950 with the 809th Engineering Battalion, served in Korea, and was discharged in 1952. He also had served 5 years in the Inactive Reserves. He is a member of The American Legion and the World War II Vets of West Mayfield, Pa. He is married and the father of three children.

Upon being hired at the Department of State in 1955, Mr. Mrkva began his duties as research clerk. In time he was promoted to control clerk and, later, time and attendance clerk, visa courier, and general services officer. It was while he was working as visa courier in the Diplomatic Section of the Passport Office that he came into contact with Zdenek Pisk of the Czechoslovakian Embassy in Washington. Pisk served as third secretary and later as second secretary of the Czechoslovakian Embassy during the years 1961-63.

The witness first met Mr. Pisk in 1961 when he had had occasion to call at the Czechoslovakian Embassy at regular intervals in connection with his normal duties as visa courier. Pisk invited the witness to attend a social reception at the Embassy and later began meeting him for dinner on a social basis. The witness explained to the subcommittee that his parents were from Czechoslovakia and that he had a natural interest in talking to someone about conditions in that country. The witness said that he spoke enough of the language to "get by" and that he enjoyed the occasional social sojourns in the company of Pisk, who, as the witness noted, was a very personable and cordial companion.

From his initial contact with Pisk, Mr. Mrkva worked closely with his State Department superiors in the Passport Office and with the FBI.

The rapport between Mr. Pisk and the witness eventually developed into an intimate social relationship. The two men had dinner at a restaurant in the Georgetown section of Washington on May 25, 1962, at which time the Czech Embassy secretary stated his interest in the operation of the passport division at the State Department. He inquired about the methods of processing passports and the type of equipment used at the Passport Office. He appeared very interested in the fact that the State Department had streamlined its Passport Office operation through modernized forms and machines. The information discussed, although unclassified in nature, was not available to Czech intelligence other than through a person such as Frank Mrkva.

On June 17, 1962, Pisk and the witness drove to Mayo Beach, Md., for an outing. No State Department business was discussed. However, on September 6, 1962, the two again met at the same Georgetown restaurant, and the Czech official once again pressed the witness for information on the equipment in the Passport Office and asked Mr. Mrkva to get any form samples for him that were unclassified.

Mr. Mrkva, after clearing the matter with his superiors, wrote a detailed report on passport processing which he passed to Mr. Pisk at Hains Point, in Washington, one Saturday morning shortly after the June meeting. After this meeting, the two had five additional meetings at various restaurants in Maryland. The meetings were arranged so that the witness would drive to the rear of a bank at an intersection in Maryland and wait. Pisk would, after checking the area, join Mr. Mrkva in his car, and the two would drive to a nearby restaurant. The witness noted that Pisk was never observed arriving for the pickup at the bank in an automobile. The Czech official was always punctual and cautioned the witness "not to talk in the car." During the last series of meetings with Pisk, Mr. Mrkva told the subcommittee, further information concerning the U.S. system of processing passports was discussed, plus a continuing debriefing of his background by Pisk.

At this point in the hearing, Mr. Watson queried the witness as to State Department policy regarding private social contacts with employees of Communist embassies. Mr. Mrkva replied that the contacts were not prohibited, but that the Department wanted to be made aware of such contacts.

The witness declined to comment on the preferability of a State Department ban on personal social contacts with Communist embassy employees. However, the witness saw nothing wrong with this type of contact as long as it was reported to superiors.

Mr. Tuck noted that but for these private social contacts there would be no way for the Government to engage in a form of counterespionage.

Mr. Mrkva told the subcommittee that he received an envelope containing \$100 from Pisk just before the Czech secretary left the country. He also received as gifts a bottle of Czech brandy, a glass vase, an ash tray, and several other small items.

Pisk's time in the United States was growing short, and at a meeting prior to his departure on May 8, 1963, Pisk told Mr. Mrkva that the both of them would "mutually benefit," "financially," if Mrkva were to continue meeting with a soon-to-arrive "friend" of Pisk's. At this meeting on March 27, 1963—the witness' last with Zdenek Pisk—Mr. Mrkva was told that the "friend" was a "professional" who would contact him as soon as he was established at the Czechoslovakian Embassy and who would give the recognition signal: "I bring greetings from Zdenek."

On December 20, 1963, Mr. Mrkva and his wife had just returned from shopping. As they parked in front of their home they noticed a man standing at their door talking to their daughter. As the Mrkvas approached, the man brushed aside Mrs. Mrkva and shook hands with the witness, saying, "I bring greetings from Zdenek." The witness knew immediately that the man was Pisk's replacement.

The new arrival was a very businesslike attaché of the Czech Embassy, whose name was Jiri Opatrny and who served in this capacity from 1963 to 1966, when he was declared persona non grata by the State Department.

Opatrny handed the witness an envelope containing a \$100 bill and an ash tray of Czechoslovakian manufacture. The witness described Opatrny as 30, aggressive, nervous, a heavy drinker and all business; as opposed to Pisk who was mild and friendly.



Opatrny attempted during their next meeting to indoctrinate the witness in the Communist philosophy. However, Mr. Mrkva stated that his only interest was monetary, which conformed with his statements to Pisk on this matter. At this statement Opatrny seemed relieved.

The many meetings with Opatrny in future months were more of a clandestine nature. True to widespread espionage tactics, danger signals were incorporated into their meetings: If the witness suspected he was being watched or followed, he was to go to a predesignated place and mark a spot on the wall with a red "X," which would be later observed by Opatrny and mean the meeting was canceled. If Mr. Mrkva had a classified document to pass to the Czech agent, he was instructed to send a post card to the Embassy with a short "Thank you" message and sign the card "Charles."

The meetings were preceded by an elaborate system of interceptions, observations, and precautionary maneuvers designed to confuse any attempt by U.S. counterespionage agents to follow either of the two men. The witness said that Opatrny knew the route of his (Mrkva's) car pool and would intercept him either going to or coming from work by standing at an intersection, which in turn was a signal to drive to another interception point.

When meetings were aborted for any reason, four alternate plans would be put into effect. In face-to-face interceptions, if either man suspected he was either being watched or followed, he would transfer a newspaper he was carrying from under his right arm to his left, or would take out a handkerchief as they approached and wipe his brow. These signals indicated that contact should be avoided. Another method was described as a system of phone booths and telephone books. Mr. Mrkva would, to signify cancellation of a meeting, travel to a pre-arranged telephone booth and draw a circle around the first name in the "M" section. Some time later, Opatrny would stop by the booth, check the book, and know that the next meeting had been called off.

The Honorable Edwin E. Willis, chairman of the full committee, at this point in the testimony, commended Mr. Mrkva for his excellent contribution to his country and to the committee. Mr. Willis stated, "I wish we had more Americans like you." Mr. Mrkva replied by saying that he, as an untrained person in counterintelligence, found the assignment a difficult one and that throughout the several years of contacts with the Czech officials he counted heavily on the advice and counsel of Mr. Robert Johnson, his superior officer in the State Department who, Mrkva stated, spent many hours with him on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays in preparation for his next meeting with the Czech espionage agent. Mr. Mrkva also noted for the record that throughout the years of contact his wife was unaware of the dangerous double life he was leading.

Mr. Mrkva told the subcommittee about the idiosyncrasies of the agent, Opatrny, who, he said, was extremely punctual (he suggested they synchronize their watches on radio time before a meeting) and very cautious. The witness said that Opatrny always set up a meeting in a large open area where he could easily observe if they were being followed. In other cases he was instructed to meet at an observation point, leave without speaking to the agent, and drive around in a residential neighborhood for a half hour, then return to the observa-

tion point. The witness surmised that in this fashion the agent could observe if he (Mrkva) was being followed. Mr. Mrkva noted that he had 37 meetings with Opatrny and 11 with Pisk for a total of 48 meetings with the Czech agents. He mentioned that Opatrny became impatient with the fact that he was not getting any classified information and encouraged the witness to cultivate friendships with other employees in various sections of the State Department in order to elicit confidential information from them. The agent asked extensive questions about the backgrounds of the members of Mrkva's car pool and especially wanted to know which employees had obvious weaknesses, such as excessive drinking habits.

Mr. Mrkva stated that, on one occasion, Opatrny had given him an obvious test to determine if he was working with counterintelligence in their meetings. The assignment, for which Opatrny would pay him \$100, was to drive to a secluded dead drop at the base of a road sign, place a cigarette packet into the drop and retrieve a cigarette pack (which Mrkva suspected might contain microfilm or microdot), and bring it back to Opatrny. The witness had debated with himself over whether to divert the pack to the FBI, but decided that the mission had all the earmarks of a test and that it would be best to carry out the assignment, which he did. A second test, the witness thought, came about when Opatrny gave the witness money to buy a small walkie-talkie set and instructed him to carry it into the State Department, leaving it in the "transmit" position. The witness stated that the walkie-talkie malfunctioned in some fashion and the batteries burned out. Opatrny had hoped to check out State Department security practices in this manner, according to the witness.

It was May 29, 1965, when Opatrny told the witness of his plan to implant a listening device in the office of the chief of the Office of Eastern European Affairs at the State Department. Opatrny instructed Mrkva to obtain floor plans of the Eastern Europe division of the State Department. The two of them carefully went over the floor plan of the office which was eventually selected to be "bugged" and bantered about various concealed spots where the device could be hidden from sight, but would pick up conversations in the room. Government furniture catalogues were obtained for Opatrny by Mrkva, and a bookcase was chosen as the most suitable place to install the listening device. Mrkva, at Opatrny's order, obtained a sample piece of wood from such a bookcase in the State Department.

One year later, Opatrny gave Mr. Mrkva a transmitting microphone embedded in a piece of wood that could be placed under the front bottom lip of a bookcase, out of sight, but in a position to receive and transmit every sound in the office of the chief of the Eastern Europe division. The witness described the device as being about 1/2 inch thick and about 12 inches long, or roughly the size of a ruler and capable of being operated by remote control from a substantial distance away. A photograph of the bugging instrument was placed in the record of the hearings as an exhibit.

If Mr. Mrkva's efforts in installing the device were successful, he was instructed to call the Communist agent and tell him that he "had made an excellent purchase." If unsuccessful he was to call and say he had "a bad headache." Likewise, if installation was unsuccessful, the witness was to drive to a predesignated theater in Maryland and return the device to Opatrny in an alley next to the theater. If successful, he was to meet Opatrny a week later and receive \$1,000 in \$20 bills.

The witness told the subcommittee that he received \$100 for expenses prior to the installation.

On the designated date in 1966, Mr. Mrkva transported the bugging device into the State Department and immediately handed it over to waiting FBI agents. The FBI agents, the witness related, transported the device to another section of the building and left it to transmit for approximately 20 minutes before removing it.

The witness met with Opatrny some time later and the two argued violently over the proposed payment for successful installation of the transmitter. Opatrny contended that the device was inoperative. The witness feigned surprise and demanded payment for the installation. At last the Czech official paid the witness \$500 and promised an additional \$1,000 if and when the device was retrieved and delivered to him. Shortly thereafter the operation was exposed and publicized.

Throughout his contacts with the two Czechoslovakian officials, Mr. Mrkva received a total of \$3,440, the bulk of which came from Jiri Opatrny and all of which was turned over to the FBI. The witness disclosed that he was asked to sign a receipt for the cash received from Opatrny, but he always signed with the alias "Zobek."

Jiri Opatrny was declared persona non grata by the Department of State in July 1966 and was given a time limit in which to gather his belongings and leave the country.

In a closing statement to the subcommittee, Mr. Mrkva said that he believed "the American public should be made aware of the activities of some of these Communist agents, who are now serving in this country, under the guise of diplomats." The witness saw how easily American citizens could be duped into furnishing information to these foreign agents "which in many cases could be very detrimental to the security of the United States." The witness was convinced that Communist agents—

are on the prowl here \* \* \* in Washington, and elsewhere in this country, keeping prearranged rendezvous, setting up arrangements for future meetings, familiarizing themselves with select areas that they plan to use for meeting places, and as drops, and it should be a matter of concern to all of us.

The witness concluded with these somber words: "When you start seeing them, and start meeting them practically in your own backyard, as it was in my case, it kind of jolts your complacency."

At the end of the testimony, subcommittee chairman, the Honorable Mr. Tuck, placed in the record a translation of an article which appeared in the May 5, 1967, publication of *Izvestia*, official organ of the Soviet Government, entitled "The Painters." The article attempted to create the impression that in holding the series of espionage hearings the Committee on Un-American Activities had been acting at the instigation of the FBI and the CIA and that it had been receiving the testimony of witnesses who had not been telling the truth. The article falsely accused various Americans of committing espionage against the Soviet Union.

#### TESTIMONY OF NATALIE ANNA BIENSTOCK

(NOVEMBER 15, 1967)

Miss Natalie Anna Bienstock, 31, a native of Prague, Czechoslovakia, testified that she came to the U.S.A. with her parents when she

was 3 years old and became a citizen of the U.S. through derivation in 1945. Her parents, who were both Russian born, had settled in Boulder, Colo., upon arrival in America.

Miss Bienstock also testified to the following facts: She attended grammar schools in New York City, Boulder, and Washington, D.C.; graduated from Bronx High School of Science, New York City, in 1954 and from City College of New York in 1958 with a B.A.; accomplished her postgraduate work at Columbia University Teachers College in New York; and received her master's degree from Cornell University in 1964.

She speaks Russian and French in addition to English.

She worked part time during college as a department store sales clerk, camp counselor, and tour guide escort. Miss Bienstock also did typing and proofreading of Russian grammar texts. During the years 1958 through 1962 she was a Russian interpreter on an assignment basis for Hurok Attractions, Inc., a company which books cultural exchange programs in this country.

Miss Bienstock also did occasional freelance translation of Russian literary works for various publishing houses and NBC television during the years 1962 to 1967.

From 1958 to 1962 the witness traveled to Canada, France, the Netherlands, Soviet Union, and Mexico. Most of the trips were taken as a tourist, but some were under the auspices of Hurok, where she was a "coordinator" for ballet troupes.

In 1961 she met a character dancer for the Leningrad Ballet whose name was Constantine Rassadin. Some months later, after much correspondence, she made a trip to Moscow and Leningrad, U.S.S.R., to visit Rassadin, spending 10 or 12 days in each city. She returned to Moscow to extend her visa, in hopes of spending more time with Rassadin. She checked into the Ukraine Hotel in Moscow and gave her passport to Intourist, requesting the extension. Later she received a call in her room from the Intourist office located in the same hotel. She supposed that the passport bureau had granted an extension of her visa. Instead, she was directed to a small adjoining room where a young man introduced himself as Viktor Sorin and stated plainly that he was an agent of the KGB (Soviet Committee of State Security), the Soviet intelligence agency.

Sorin was very pleasant, according to the witness, and said "that he was not going to pull any of my nails out, because times have changed, and he just wanted to talk to me."

The KGB man indicated to Miss Bienstock that she had been followed during the entire trip to Leningrad and Moscow and that the KGB had a complete dossier on her entire family.

Sorin stated that Soviet members of cultural exchange groups to America had to be protected because American agents were "trying to recruit them while they were abroad." Despite her repeated denials, the KGB agent insisted that the witness must be an American agent to have worked with the Hurok staff for so long. Nevertheless, he told her that he thought she would be an ideal person to take care of these Soviet performers while they were in the United States.

Agent Sorin appeared to have limitless knowledge concerning the lineage and background of the witness. (She estimated that 90% of her relatives had been executed or died from other causes in

Soviet concentration camps.) This first interrogation in the Ukraine Hotel lasted for 6 or 7 hours, after which the agent advised the witness to think about their "conversation." Her passport, which was lying on the desk during her interrogation, was not returned to her.

After returning to her room in the hotel, the KGB agent kept the pressure on the witness by making a number of nuisance calls. The following day, the 9th of March 1962, she was subjected to a second 7-hour session of interrogation.

She was instructed to go to another room in the Ukraine Hotel where Viktor Sorin was again waiting for her. He reiterated many of the facts known by the KGB regarding her personal and private life that had been disclosed to her the previous day. He continued to play on her emotions through various tactics and plied her with vodka as well.

She was, in this manner, induced to sign a statement which declared that she was, or would become, an agent for the KGB and report the names of American agents in the U.S. who attempted to contact anyone in the Russian cultural exchange groups. She was also told to report any suspicious actions by the Russian members of the groups who might appear disloyal to the government. She was "recruited" into Moscow's employ through coercion by fear.

Miss Bienstock was given two code names and was instructed to contact a Soviet citizen, *Leo Sorokin*, via secret writing, at 680 Park Avenue, N.Y.C., then the Soviet United Nations mission address in New York. She was provided with chemically treated paper and was schooled in secret writing for sending messages to her contact—Sorokin—in the U.S.

(One *Alexander Sorokin* was formerly an attaché at the Russian Embassy in Mexico and was a member of the Soviet U.N. mission in this country from 1960 through August 1963. No *Leo Sorokin* was listed at that address at that time.)

As soon as Miss Bienstock agreed to act as an informant for the KGB, her passport was returned to her.

Upon arrival back in America, the witness, per instructions by Sorin, attempted to meet "an unspecified agent" 2 weeks later in the Bronx section of New York City. She kept the appointment, but did not make contact. She had been previously instructed to return to the same location 2 weeks later if for any reason the first meeting was aborted. She did not keep the second appointment.

Miss Bienstock received a letter from Sorokin after missing the second meeting. He asked her for the names of any American agents who had been in touch with Russians (at the Hurok Agency). She gave the agent the names of American agents who had been in touch with her—but did not have information concerning contacts between U.S. agents and Russian nationals.

In repeated letters from Sorokin, the witness was told to get more names. She sent back—in the same secret fashion—the names of everyone on the Hurok Agency staff.

Over a period of 11 months, Miss Bienstock sent approximately seven secret letters to her contact. The letters, for the most part, reiterated the same set of names.

Sorokin, in return, would express his displeasure with the information and demand additional names, as well as those of disloyal Rus-

sians. The witness stated that it was her intent to give the contact as little information as possible.

Miss Bienstock never received any remuneration from the KGB and finally ceased all correspondence and broke with the KGB in February 1963.

The witness testified that she did not contact authorities in the FBI until fully a year and a half later. During this period, she imagined that disclosure of her activities would have brought about her deportation from the U.S.

In her closing statement, the witness spoke of her own immaturity in allowing the KGB to coerce her into any dealing with them at all. She said that she had never been exposed to the "bad side" of the Russians and, despite warnings from her mother, placed herself in a precarious position of which the Soviet secret police were quick to take advantage.

In conclusion, the witness agreed that the Soviets would take advantage of every opportunity to try to recruit and enlist American citizens in espionage activities against their own country.

#### **LEGISLATIVE HEARINGS ON BILLS TO AMEND THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT OF 1950**

On August 15, 16, 17, and 18, 1967, the House Committee on Un-American Activities held public legislative hearings in Washington, D.C., in relation to bills to amend certain provisions of title I of the Internal Security Act of 1950, designated as the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950.

These hearings were held to receive testimony on bills H.R. 10390, H.R. 10391, and H.R. 10681, identical bills introduced respectively by Hon. Edwin E. Willis, chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, Hon. John M. Ashbrook, ranking minority member of the committee, and Hon. Arnold Olsen. H.R. 10390, introduced by Mr. Willis, was cosponsored by 24 other Democratic Members. Similarly 24 Republicans joined Mr. Ashbrook in sponsoring H.R. 10391.

The purpose of these bills, in accordance with certain applicable decisions of the Federal courts, was to establish a system of public disclosure of the identity of Communist organizations and members of Communist-action organizations. Further it would improve and strengthen the administration of the title by the inclusion of additional provisions defining the meaning of "Communist-front" organizations. It would enlarge the Attorney General's register of Communist organizations, requiring the disclosure of Communist organizations using the mail or any facility of interstate or foreign commerce to solicit money or property, expediting procedures for registration of individual members of Communist-action organizations, requiring Board determinations with respect to Communist organizations dissolving subsequent to the filing of the Attorney General's initiating petition for determination, providing grant of immunity for compulsory testimony and production of evidence over self-incrimination claims, authorizing and prescribing penalties for misbehavior in the presence of the board, and denying jurisdiction to Federal courts to entertain certain dilatory collateral proceedings.

[H.R. 12601, reported as a result of these hearings, passed the House on November 28, 1967. Its provisions were then inserted as an

amendment to S. 2171, which was referred to conference, and was passed by the House and Senate, respectively, on December 13 and 14 and signed into law (Public Law 90-237) by the President on January 2, 1968.]

Mr. Willis opened the hearings on August 15 by stating that when the committee had drafted the Internal Security Act in 1947, it determined that the reason the Communist Party had achieved the success that it had in this country—considering its relative size—was chiefly because of the party's ability to conceal the fact that it had created and controlled certain organizations which then posed as non-Communist groups. Secondly, the party had seized control of still other originally bona fide organizations, concealing here, too, the fact of party infiltration and influence.

The committee concluded that a means had to be found to disclose these hidden operations and the real aim and nature—including foreign control—of the party. The committee was convinced that the American people would never buy communism if it were "truthfully packaged," with its aims and nature clearly printed on the wrapper.

Mr. Willis then quoted from the 1947 report of President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights:

The principle of disclosure is, we believe, the appropriate way to deal with those who would subvert our democracy by revolution or by encouraging disunity and destroying the civil rights of some groups. \* \* \*

The chairman stated that the bills under consideration would amend the registration or disclosure provisions of the Internal Security Act—without infringing upon the fifth amendment rights of individuals—by requiring the Attorney General to keep a register of those organizations found by the Subversive Activities Control Board (SACB) to have been, in fact, Communist as defined. Heretofore, the alleged Communist organization was compelled to register itself as to the fact that it was a Communist group.

Another proposed amendment was one to redefine the term "Communist-front organization." The courts had stated that it was not enough to show that a group was controlled by the Communist Party, but a case had to be made also to prove that the members of the party in such a group were actually acting on behalf of the Communist Party in their actions.

#### HON. DURWARD G. HALL

Congressman Durward Hall (R-Mo.), who had cosponsored the proposed legislation and who was the first witness to testify on August 15, raised the question of whether the Internal Security Act in its present form would cover the activities of the newer type of subversive organization, namely, the militant, violence-oriented racist [black nationalist] groups which were currently advocating guerrilla warfare in America and the assassination of elected officials. The chairman replied that the committee's staff had been directed to make a preliminary inquiry into the riots which had taken place, in order to determine whether any subversive elements were involved. Mr. Willis explained that the term "subversive elements" was broad enough to include both Communist as well as non-Communist groups such as the Black Panthers.

Congressman Hall suggested that the Registration Act be broadened to incorporate additional groups such as these.

Adoption of this legislation, he testified, would insure a productive workload for the SACB and would provide a great service to the Nation.

Congressman Hall, responding to a question from a committee member, stated that the proposed legislation would benefit the country and, at the same time, protect the rights of the individual.

#### JAMES B. GARDINER

Mr. James B. Gardiner testified on behalf of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution in his capacity as its vice president.

Mr. Gardiner supported the amendments on the grounds that any legislation, such as that proposed in these bills, which would bring into the open those organizations which foster widespread Communist activity, would be in keeping with the basic policies of his group. Moreover, the proposed legislation would give the courts, which had construed the Internal Security Act very strictly in the past, a clearer idea of the intent of Congress, he said.

Mr. Gardiner suggested, however, that the proposed legislation, which provides that a dissolved Communist-action or Communist-front organization can be registered by the Attorney General, should include Communist-infiltrated groups as well. His organization, he testified, has consistently taken the position that "probably the greatest danger" in America today is Communist infiltration, at strategic levels, of political, economic, educational, and religious institutions.

#### ROBERT MORRIS

Mr. Robert Morris, the first witness to testify on August 16, is president of the University of Plano, in Plano, Tex., and had been the former chief counsel of the U.S. Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

Mr. Morris testified that the tactical approach to the problem created by the courts concerning the proposed amendments is to revise the Internal Security Act without varying its fundamental strategy. The original function of the Board could still be achieved by making the SACB's findings—rather than the registration of Communist groups by the Attorney General—the action which would set in motion the remedial provisions of the bill. Reasonable disclosure of the conspiracy of a given group would therefore be retained.

The witness suggested that all other features of the present act remain intact, including the penalties for its violations and the definitions of Communist organizations, because otherwise, Mr. Morris testified, long legal proceedings would result and 17 frustrating years of effort would be lost.

#### JOHN W. MAHAN

Mr. John W. Mahan, Chairman of the Subversive Activities Control Board, submitted a statement which stated in part that:

It is absolutely crucial that the Nation take every reasonable and lawful means to protect itself against Communist subversion. Whatever is done with respect to the S.A.C.B. should be done with care and deliberation. \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*



We do know that many organizations ceased their Communist-directed activities and dissolved when threatened with disclosure by the Board. Part of the statutory concept of a Communist front is that it conceals the facts as to its true character and purpose. Many people would not render support to such an organization once the true facts are known. The Court of Appeals has stated in a formal opinion that when a Communist-front group dissolves, "the purposes of the Act, and more, are accomplished." \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

The Communist activities included in the Board's findings in these cases cover many and varied fields, such as: sit-ins, rallies, marches, and other protests against the foreign and domestic policies of our government; Communist educational programs to indoctrinate our youth in Marxism-Leninism; Communist efforts to infiltrate legitimate civil rights organizations and other groups to covertly guide them to following the Communist line. Disclosure of such activities has obvious value since a well-informed public is a well-armed public.

The witness testified that the SACB has conducted 70 adversary proceedings since the act was first passed in 1950. In one case [the Communist Party], which took over a decade to complete, the record contained 16,824 pages of transcript and 745 exhibits, a testimonial in itself to the patient, fair, and legal procedures of the Board.

The Chairman of SACB supported the proposed bills which, among other things, eliminated the compulsory self-registration orders for Communist-action organizations in the act. This comported with the Supreme Court's decision in the *Albertson* case in 1965, namely, that a member of the Communist Party who had taken the fifth amendment privilege against self-incrimination was not required to incriminate himself by an order of the Board to register.

Mr. Mahan's view concerning the mandatory registration of Communist-front organizations was that they, too, should not be ordered to register because of the legal problems involved in proving agency of the front to its principal—a Communist-action group. The witness recommended also that the SACB itself should maintain the official registration list of groups found to be Communist, rather than the Attorney General, since the Department of Justice was the party initiating and prosecuting the action.

#### STANLEY J. TRACY

The next witness was Mr. Stanley J. Tracy, a former Assistant Director of the FBI and associate counsel of the Commission on Government Security which had reviewed all the Federal security programs in 1956-57.

The witness said that it was "vitally important" that the Internal Security Act of 1950 be amended because of what had transpired at the 18th National Convention of the Communist Party in 1966.

The witness testified that, based upon the official statement made by the general secretary, Gus Hall, at the convention, the Communist Party was going to move into the civil rights movement—and in fact already had. The party, Mr. Tracy said, also considers that the New Left organizations are a "fertile field" for exploitation and potential recruitment because of their hostility to the Government.

The party is going to get behind every movement in which it can foster demonstrations and cause unrest, chaos, and civil disobedience, he said.

For these reasons the national security program and the SACB will be strengthened by the passage of the proposed amendments. The witness supported all sections of the amendments excepting section 3.

Here Mr. Tracy suggested that the SACB itself be the keeper of the registration lists, rather than the Department of Justice, on the basis that the functions of prosecutor and administrator should be kept separate.

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

A statement for the record in support of the proposed amendments was submitted by Congressman Henry C. Schadeberg (R-Wis.), a cosponsor of the legislation. Mr. Schadeberg's statement declared that "it is imperative that the Internal Security Act be made as constitutionally taut as possible so that our Federal officers may carry out their duties with efficiency and dispatch."

STATEMENT OF THE MILITARY ORDER OF THE WORLD WARS

Brigadier General [USA-Ret.] Louis J. Fortier, commander in chief of the Military Order of the World Wars, on behalf of that organization, gave his endorsement of the proposed legislation.

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION

Mildred B. Harman submitted a statement on behalf of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, which supported the proposed bills as vitally necessary in order to "have a reliable public register of the Communist-controlled or affiliated organizations."

Her statement explained that many organizations had a need for such information and that she herself, a freelance writer and editor of the "Washington Letter" for the WCTU organ, *Union Signal*, required such information from the SACB records to keep her readership informed of the truth about certain subversive groups.

HON. SPEEDY O. LONG

Congressman Speedy Long (D-La.), a cosponsor of the chairman's bill, stated that "the Communist Party continuously spins off," from the main body, groups of subversive organizations. These front groups are "virtually unrecognizable to the casual observer"—the majority of the population—and this only increases their danger to the Republic.

Mr. Long stated that the bill was an admirable effort to establish machinery for dealing with front groups which "harass the flanks of representative government." It "unmasks the subversive group and casts the light of justice upon its Communist connections and direction." When discovered, his statement continued, such organizations "shrink and quickly disappear." The fact that they often reappear in another guise soon after is only more reason to establish the bill as law. "Vigilance," he concluded, "is still the price of freedom."

MARVIN KARPATKIN

Marvin Karparkin was the witness on behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union and a director on its national board. Mr. Karparkin spoke against the proposed amendments to the Internal Security Act and suggested that the committee repeal the act itself.

The ACLU witness opposed section 1 of the amendment on the basis that he believed that there was no constitutional power to proscribe Communist-front organizations of any kind. Karpatkin stated that there was "grave danger" organizations which have "liberal views" might also be stigmatized by being classified as Communist fronts.

Concerning section 2 of the bill, the witness stated that the problem of self-incrimination would still remain, regardless of whether the procedure for ordered registration by the Board was voided. There is still, Karpatkin said, self-incrimination if the individual is faced with a choice of avoiding penalty A by accepting penalty B.

Section 4 of the amendment was objected to on the grounds that it applied to an oral solicitation made in a public speech which in itself was an advocacy rather than an overt act and, moreover, difficult to prove, said the witness.

Karpatkin objected to section 5(a) of the bill, which concerned the registration of dissolved organizations. The witness declared that this procedure would be a determination of guilt without a hearing and since the group was dissolved there would not be any persons qualified to testify on its behalf.

Karpatkin took exception also to section 5(d)(2) of the bill pertaining to the "misbehavior" of a witness before the SACB or one of its examiners. He said that this term was too vague and therefore might be made applicable to accidental events, such as spilling some water.

Karpatkin's last objection was to the final section which he said was, in part, unconstitutional on the grounds that it denied the citizen the right to have immediate redress for injury. While Congress can expand or contract the jurisdiction of Federal courts, it cannot deny the courts the right to protect the citizen who has been subject to injury.

#### FRANCIS W. STOVER

Mr. Francis W. Stover, director of the National Legislative Service of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, testified on August 17. He stated that the VFW had supported the creation of the SACB in 1950. The purpose of the Board was to reveal to the American people the activities of Communist fronts and Communist-infiltrated organizations because such groups constituted a real and continuing danger to the national welfare.

It has therefore, Mr. Stover said, "come as a shock" to the VFW to learn that legislation has been introduced to abolish the Board.

The VFW spokesman produced a copy of Resolution No. 268 which had been adopted by the VFW delegates at their national convention in August 1966. Entitled "To Strengthen Internal Security Act," it stated:

WHEREAS, decisions of the United States Supreme Court have greatly weakened the Internal Security Act of 1950; and

WHEREAS, the Veterans of Foreign Wars was one of the sponsors and strong supporters of the Internal Security Act and amendments thereto since that time; and

WHEREAS, the Veterans of Foreign Wars has always led the fight to expose and identify communists and others who would undermine and destroy our Government and way of life; and

WHEREAS, there is now pending in the 89th Congress a bill, H.R. 16584 [the number of the chairman's bill in 1966], which would greatly strengthen and improve the Internal Security Act and overcome the decisions of the Supreme Court which have greatly weakened the Internal Security Act; now, therefore

**BE IT RESOLVED**, by the 67th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, that the Veterans of Foreign Wars supports H.R. 16584 and works for its advancement and approval by the Congress.

The current bill, Mr. Stover said, is the logical successor to the older bill.

He noted that the Board "is the only agency in the executive branch" which has the authority to provide the American public with the kind of information it needs to determine to what extent the Communists are a threat to the Nation. Moreover, the Board does not operate behind closed doors, but conducts its hearings in the open—in public. It makes written findings of fact and conclusions of law which, finally, are subject to judicial review. If the Board's orders are appealed, they cannot become effective until they have been reviewed and sustained by the court.

The fact that the Board has had little to do recently, for reasons beyond its control, is "the most compelling reason" that the proposed legislation should be favorably reported by the committee, urged the VFW witness.

**DANIEL J. O'CONNOR**

(Represented by Mr. John S. Mears)

The next witness to testify was Mr. John S. Mears, who substituted for Mr. Daniel J. O'Connor, the chairman of the National Americanism Commission of The American Legion.

Mr. Mears stated that The American Legion supported the proposed bills which would "breathe new life" into the SACB and provide the safeguards for internal security needed now and in the years ahead.

The term "Communist-front organization" needed to be clearly defined so that there would be no judicial interpretation which would excuse such organizations from the registration procedures of the SACB.

Secondly, the relationship between the Communist Party and its front organization must be clearly established because it is "folly to conclude that no communication exists."

The provision to provide a person who has made a bona fide defection from a Communist-front organization, with the means to file an affidavit establishing that fact is, Mr. Mears said, a significant factor.

He also supported as a salient feature of the bill the requirement that Communist-sponsored programs carried by radio and TV stations be identified as such by the broadcasting media. Similarly, the safeguard requiring a statement of the true identity of sponsorship in mail solicitation by Communist organizations was supported by the Legion.

The Legion also supported the feature of the bill pertaining to the holding of hearings and the attending registration by the SACB of Communist organizations which had dissolved themselves to avoid disclosure.

The Legion's statement concluded with an excerpt of an official pronouncement by Gus Hall, general secretary of the Communist Party (U.S.A.), made at a meeting of its National Committee in 1966, as follows:

We must ask again: Is it correct or is it false to say that political independence is a process that is proceeding on many different levels, in many different forms? And

are there not periods when the process takes on a qualitative surge? We are at such a moment now.

This characterization dictates two tactical considerations. One is that our leadership must consider problems of work on all levels. The second is that the qualitative shift calls for more initiative, more boldness, more experimentation with independent forms.

I would summarize the three levels of independence as follows:

- (1) Independent movements within the two parties—
- (2) Independent movements politically and organizationally outside of the two parties, but still using the two parties' electoral process, especially in primaries.
- (3) Broad, Left independent movements which very often include ourselves, the Communists.

The witness stated that it was imperative that the Congress take affirmative action to insure that the SACB can function as it was originally intended to by Congress and that it be permitted to carry out its duties as defined in the Internal Security Act of 1950.

#### HON. MICHAEL A. MUSMANNO

The first witness on August 18 was the Hon. Michael A. Musmanno, formerly a judge on the International War Crimes Tribunal at Nuremburg, and a judge of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court since 1952.

Judge Musmanno testified that the Federal courts, in their application of the first and fifth amendments to the Constitution, "dismantled many guns of the Internal Security Act," H.R. 10390, he said, provides the armament required to reestablish the act. Under some court decisions the Communists have been able to turn the fifth amendment into a "fifth column marching against the security of the Nation."

Concerning a front organization, the judge said that it should be enough to show that it is a front if the Government proves that a Communist is directing its activities and that that person is in fact a member of the Communist Party.

Since it has been proved by "hundreds of congressional investigations, thousands of witnesses, and billions of words of testimony, as well as countless irrefutable acts of revolutionary planning, plus demonstrated violence, that the Communist Party in America is a predatory wolf on an ever-lengthening leash from Russia," the judge said that he could not understand why party organizations should be allowed to use Government facilities, such as the mails, to solicit funds for projects designed to demolish American freedoms.

Referring to section 5, the section on dissolved organizations, he said that this section will make it difficult for the Communists "within the skin of the dead dragon"—or a live one only playing dead—"to crawl out and operate within the skin of another animal."

Concerning the solicitation of an innocent member of such a group who had become entrapped by the Communists, Judge Musmanno said that it is proper that the method of his entrapment be made public. The victim's involvement should not be concealed since it might come out later in the form of an accusation of disloyalty. The innocent party should welcome an opportunity to come before the Board and explain how he was fooled and deceived, thus clearing his name and protecting others who might become entrapped.

Judge Musmanno supported all sections of the bill except paragraph 4 of section 5, whereby the courts were denied jurisdiction to question the proceedings before the Board after the hearing in question

had been completed. He said he doubted that the Supreme Court would sustain a legislative enactment of this kind.

The chairman explained that the purpose of that paragraph was to impede the activities of those organizations which would use the courts as a means of attacking collaterally and dilatorily the proceedings of the Board.

The judge suggested then that a time limit, such as 10-30 days, be placed on an appeal and if the court fails to dispose of the appeal in that time, the Board may again proceed with its hearings.

The witness concluded his statement by saying that where the security of the country is involved, Congress should "look with a zealously scrutinizing eye on decisions of the courts which weaken the Nation's defenses against the Communist fifth column." As Congress may override the veto of the President by a two-thirds vote, it should have the same power to veto the decisions of the Supreme Court where national security is involved.

#### LOYD WRIGHT

Mr. Loyd Wright, former president of the American Bar Association and former Chairman of the Commission on Government Security, testified in an individual capacity in support of the amendments being considered.

The main thrust of Mr. Wright's statement was directed at the courts which, by their decisions, had made the job of the Congress in security matters more difficult.

He said that the security of the Nation had been "imperiled by the decisions, generally 5-4 or 6-3, of a Supreme Court which has taken to itself the prerogative of invading the legislative function of our National Government and imposing its will on the several States irrespective of the provisions of the 10th amendment."

Moreover, Mr. Wright said, the courts have written into law their ideological philosophies, often in complete disregard of established law, and have "well-nigh destroyed congressional efforts to preserve our national security."

The witness took exception to the amendment making it a crime to "misbehave" before the SACB, on the basis that that term was too uncertain. He suggested that the concept be spelled out in accordance with the judicial canon of ethics, or else have the SACB adopt its own code of behavior.

Another point with which Mr. Wright was concerned was section 6 of the Internal Security Act which had been invalidated by the Supreme Court's decision in the case of *Aptheker v. Secretary of State*. The witness differed with the Court's decision by suggesting that it had no legal basis for declaring that a passport is a matter of right, and nowhere in the Constitution or in the Bill of Rights is it so declared.

The possession of a passport is a matter of privilege, he said, and privileges are accorded only to those who merit them. Moreover, Mr. Wright suggested that every passport that is issued should bear the fingerprint of the person to whom it is issued. Communists have used legitimate passports acquired by unlawful means for the purpose of illicitly bringing persons into this country to serve the purposes of the party. Fingerprinting the lawful owner of the document would eliminate much of this traffic.

Secondly, Mr. Wright recommended that the function of issuing passports be transferred to the Attorney General's office to avoid the political considerations found in the Department of State affecting passports.

Mr. Wright's last point applied to the Supreme Court. First, recent Supreme Court decisions have been decided by one or three men on the nine-man panel. This means that one man or several who have no direct responsibility to the people, and who are politically appointed, can himself or themselves amend the Constitution. Yet, when a genuine constitutional amendment is proposed, it requires a three-fourths vote of the 50 States to approve it.

Therefore, it should be required that decisions of the Supreme Court dealing with a State constitution or the U.S. Constitution should also require the approval or disapproval of three-fourths of the Justices.

#### A. LEO ANDERSON

Mr. A. Leo Anderson, national commander of the American Veterans of World War II, submitted a statement for the record in support of the proposed legislation.

The AMVETS' statement pointed out that the group shared the misgivings of those who found disquieting the renewed campaign to abolish the SACB.

It continued:

AMVETS feels that the device of attacking H.R. 10390 by directing inappropriate attention to the character or qualification of individual members or proposed appointees to the Board is a transparent one. In a substantial sense, it has nothing whatever to do with the function of the Board, whose record over 17 years has been excellent, acting as it has within somewhat severe limitations. The conduct of its proceedings and its highly informative reports have provided the Nation with material it had a right to know, which was of real value and service to the development of informed public opinion and action. The continuous efforts of Communist and other organizations to hamstring its activities and to raise unending constitutional questions as to the procedures of Board functions in some areas, in all fairness cannot be attributed to the fault of the Board, for failing to accomplish more than it has.

It is both the strength and weakness of our system of law and government that in providing safeguards for the innocent it furnishes the unscrupulous and subversive possibility for prolonged legal delays. This, too, cannot be attributed to fault in either the Internal Security Act or to the Subversive Activities Control Board. It would be and is ridiculous to suggest that because legal procedures are time consuming and frustrating to those charged in carrying out their duties under the law in behalf of the Nation's security, that we abolish both law and Board. Frustrating indeed has been the record to date of the attempts of the Board to investigate and inform the Nation as to the activities of the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs in America. \* \* \*

The recent events throughout the length and breadth of our land at least raises the question in the minds of even the most skeptical that there is a pressing need for a thorough investigation into the real underlying causes and policies being advocated; the accurate identification of both the leadership and the sponsorship, both financial and organizational, if such covert and anonymous leadership exists in a coordinated, organized, and centrally directed way. The Subversive Activities Control Board, both by experience, performance and law, is the organization best designed to undertake such a revealing study. \* \* \*

#### JAMES J. DAVIDSON, JR.

Mr. James J. Davidson, Jr., former president of the Louisiana Bar Association, submitted a statement in support of the legislation which

stated that it has been a source of distress to ordinary patriotic American citizens that fundamental rights of the individual should be used by those whose stated objective was to destroy and overthrow the American system of government.

The witness spoke favorably of the proposed amendments, including the new definition of a Communist front:

Time does not permit a discussion of all of the various provisions of the bill, but it now sufficiently defines a "Communist Front" so that it would include those organizations which are operated or infiltrated by members of the Communist Party, and would to a great extent eliminate the difficult problem of developing and presenting sufficient proof of Communist control of a "front" organization to result in judicial determination and action. It likewise prevents the "stalling" of actions begun against recognized Communist-front or Communist-action organizations through the medium of dissolution of the organization involved, and permits the authorities to proceed with the action which may have been instituted and to carry it to a final determination, instead of having the action declared to be moot so that the activities conducted by that particular organization may be simply transferred to some other media and continued.

#### JOHN C. SATTERFIELD

The next statement received for the record of these hearings was that of John C. Satterfield, former president of the American Bar Association and assistant to former Attorney General Tom Clark.

The witness supported all of the amendments, but addressed himself particularly to several key sections, including the section which called for dropping the self-registration provision of the current act in favor of the system of registration by the Attorney General; identification of the sponsor of public solicitation through the mails, radio, or television; the granting of the power of giving immunity to the Attorney General for witnesses who otherwise might not choose to testify before the SACB; and the proposed authority to conduct proceedings against an organization which had dissolved itself following the initiation of such proceedings by the Attorney General.

The latter provision, Mr. Satterfield's statement pointed out, would abort this maneuver which prevents American citizens from learning the true nature of such organizations. Moreover, should it be determined during the proceedings that the organization was not communistic at the time of the initiation of the proceedings, then those persons who had been innocently entrapped would be protected.

#### PEYTON FORD

The next statement to be received by the committee was that of Peyton Ford, former Deputy Attorney General of the United States who had witnessed and participated in the passage of the Internal Security Act of 1950.

Pertinent passages of his testimony in support of the proposed legislation were as follows:

1. In Section 1(B) the amendment offers a more comprehensive definition of the term "Communist-front organization." The purpose of the amendment is obviously to overcome the burden imposed by the Court in *National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc. v. SACB*, 322 F. 2d 375. The amendment recognizes the need to enlarge the definition in order to police the more subtle and shadowy forms which the Communist-action groups have taken on. Since the decision of the Supreme Court in 1961 determining that the Communist Party was a Communist-action group controlled by a foreign power, the movement has more than ever splintered into fronts that did not heretofore exist.



These fronts are at the present time the primary source of party funds and party action. The criterion proposed by Section 1(B), control by one or more members of a Communist-action organization, will permit the Attorney General to register these organizations, thus exposing the nature of their operation to the public.

2. Section 4 of the amendment proposes to alter section 10 of the present act by requiring the envelope, wrapper, or container in which any publication of such an organization is transmitted to be labeled—disseminated by blank organization which has been determined by a final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board to be a Communist organization. The American public has the right to know who or what organization is sending material through the mail or soliciting its funds.

The present amendment is in many respects akin to the requirement that cigarette manufacturers place on their package the warning that "smoking may be dangerous to your health" or as has been recently suggested that "smoking has been determined by the Surgeon General to be dangerous to health." In either situation the label is not an admission that cigarette smoking is dangerous or that the manufacturer has determined smoking is dangerous. To the contrary, the determination to smoke or not smoke is left with the consumer—the manufacturer is merely complying with the law. Similarly, the Communist front is not admitting that it is a Communist front, but is merely putting the public on notice that it has been so determined by an independent body. The reader, fully apprised of the facts, can do as he pleases.

Mr. Ford's statement pointed out, however, that in the area of free speech requirements, such as this, more precision was required. It was his view that the problem may be resolved "by making the label more specific," that is, to spell out the type of Communist organization, e.g., front, action, or infiltrated, so that the public may be made aware of what the Board determined it to be.

Concerning the amendment which would withdraw jurisdiction from the courts, Mr. Ford, unlike Judge Musmanno, believed that the measure was more in the nature of an administrative rule relating to interlocutory appeals. Moreover, the proposed amendment does not limit the right of appeal, but merely states that appeal will be available at the end of the hearing. This proposal is intended to prevent time-consuming delays caused by injudicious and specious appeals.

However, Mr. Ford recommended that the phrase, "or otherwise," be stricken so as not to conflict with the power of the court to issue extraordinary writs.

Lastly, the witness suggested that a broader definition of "Communist front" might be necessary in keeping with the ideological split between Red China and the U.S.S.R. The proposed amendment, he noted, was directed at Soviet communism [and therefore Communist Party, U.S.A., fronts which followed Moscow's line rather than that of Red China; whose own fronts may be untouched by this legislation.]

#### HON. ARMISTEAD SELDEN

Representative Armistead Selden (D-Ala.), a cosponsor of the bill, stated in his remarks on the proposed measure that a reliable public register of Communist organizations and individuals was badly needed.

Since the Communist Party works primarily through front organizations which appear on the surface to be social, fraternal, or benevolent groups, and since large sums of money are collected by these groups from an unsuspecting public, it is necessary that the ordinary American citizen be absolutely aware of where his funds are going and for what purpose they are to be used.

Registration and disclosure laws now on the books, he stated, include lobbyists and corporate entities in their provisions. Therefore, there

is no blanket constitutional prohibition against public disclosure of information to protect the American citizen.

#### HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

Congressman Dante B. Fascell (D-Fla.) stated in his remarks supporting the legislation that since 1950 the SACB has investigated more than 70 organizations suspected of being under the influence of international communism.

However, in 1965 the Supreme Court's decision concerning the registration requirements contained within the Internal Security Act vacated 27 registration orders of the SACB against persons held to be members of the Communist Party.

The proposed legislation would clarify congressional intent in this area which has wavered since the Internal Security Act was first passed.

#### HON. ODIN LANGEN

Representative Odin Langen (R-Minn.), in support of the legislation which he had cosponsored, stated that the "American people are sick and tired of the extent to which subversive elements in this country are permitted under law to continue their insidious activities free from public knowledge and punishment."

Congress, he said, will help preserve freedom by hitting hardest at subversive elements which aim to destroy democracy in this Nation.

### THE NEW COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA LINE ON RELIGION

#### TESTIMONY OF REV. RICHARD WURMBRAND

A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities held a public hearing in Washington, D.C., on August 10, 1967, to receive the testimony of the Reverend Richard Wurmbrand.

The subcommittee members were: Hon. William M. Tuck (D-Va.), chairman; Hon. Edwin E. Willis (D-La.), chairman of the full committee; Hon. John C. Culver (D-Iowa); Hon. Richard L. Roudebush (R-Ind.); and Hon. Albert W. Watson (R-S.C.).

The hearing was held pursuant to a committee resolution which authorized that hearings be held "relating to the extent and character of Communist propaganda and conspiratorial techniques employed within the United States to promote the objectives of the Communist Party in the United States and to advance the purposes of the world Communist movement by the dissemination of false and misleading information concerning Communist doctrine and practices in regard to religion and ethnic and minority groups."

In his opening statement the chairman cited statements by Lenin and Stalin regarding the traditional Communist position on religion. He also reviewed other Communist statements on the subject:

Sixty-two years ago, Lenin wrote:

"'Religion is the opium of the people.' Religion is a kind of spiritual vodka in which the slaves of capital drown their human shape and their claims to any decent human life."

Forty years ago, Stalin wrote:

"The [Communist] Party cannot be neutral towards religion. . . . Anti-religious propaganda is a means by which the complete liquidation of the reactionary clergy must be brought about."

In 1946 an official Soviet organ, *Young Bolshevik*, stated:

"Dialectical materialism, the philosophy of Marxism-Leninism and the theoretical foundation of the Communist Party, is incompatible with religion. . . . the [Communist] Party . . . is bound to oppose religion."

Going back to Lenin again, he stated in 1909 that "Marxism is . . . relentlessly hostile to religion."

Earl Browder, for many years the leader of the Communist Party in this country, stated that "the Communist Party is the enemy of religion."

The chairman also noted that as recently as 1964 the Soviet Communist Party had established an Institute of Scientific Atheism to direct an intensified campaign against religious beliefs at every level and in every walk of Soviet life.

The chairman then quoted several recent statements which revealed that Communists had ostensibly reversed their position on religion and were now telling Christians that they can and must work together with Communists to obtain what they call a common goal—a better world for mankind.

The chairman pointed out that:

These recent statements by Communist officials and publications, if sincere, are certainly earth-shaking. If they are genuine, they reflect a major and fundamental change in basic Communist doctrine, a change that could have far-reaching effects in all parts of the world, a change that could reshape the thinking of millions of people on the subject of communism.

The Communists, of course, have made many false and treacherous statements in the past to serve their devious purposes. The 50-year history of their dealings with non-Communists on all levels, governmental and otherwise, is filled with examples of this—calculated, cynically and grossly false statements made by Communists and their agents for no other reason than to mislead non-Communists about the real nature and intent of communism.

He asked this question: "Is the new Communist line on religion another example of this, or does it actually indicate a real change in communism?"

Rev. Richard Wurmbrand testified to develop for the record facts which would assist the Congress and the American people in answering that question.

Reverend Wurmbrand is a Lutheran pastor and a native of Rumania. He was imprisoned after the Communist takeover of his country and was released in 1964 as a part of a general amnesty, after having spent 14 years in prison. He arrived in the United States in 1966.

Reverend Wurmbrand produced many letters from prominent clergymen in Europe and in the United States attesting to his reliability. He bears 18 ugly scars on his back, a proof of the physical tortures he had suffered at the hands of the Communist regime in Rumania. The scars, he said, "are not mine; they are signs of the torturing of my fatherland and of my church."

The witness spoke with the knowledge and emotion one might expect from a man who had experienced a Communist takeover of his country and suffered unmercifully at the hands of the oppressors for his religious beliefs.

He said that before the Communists came to power in Rumania, persons who warned what would happen to religion under communism were "besmeared." He also testified that Rumanian churches had been infiltrated prior to the Communist takeover:

Professor Constantinescu Iashi was one of the best known theological professors of Rumania. When the Communists came to power, he became Communist

Minister of Culture, a member of the Communist government. People opened their eyes and asked, "But how? You have prepared for ministry thousands of priests. How is it?" He answered, "I have been sent by the Communist Party in the theological seminary."

Bende, the secretary of the Protestant seminary in Cluj in the capitalist times, says that he has been sent by the party there to prepare the students in the radical sense.

When the Communists came to power in Rumania, Orthodox priests, Riosheanu, Patrashcoiu, and others, appeared dressed at once as colonels of the secret police and arrested and beat their parishioners. When the parishioners asked them, "But how is this possible? This is a nightmare. You have been my priest; I kissed your hand; I took the sacraments from you," they answered: "You dupes, you idiots, the Communist Party has sent us in the church."

After his release from prison, Reverend Wurmbrand stated, he was called before the secret police on two occasions and was told: "Now you leave [Rumania]. Preach Christ as much as you like, but don't touch us!" If he spoke against communism, the secret police warned, he would either be shot or kidnaped and returned to Rumania. He said he had known men in prison who had been "brought back," and although he must live with the fear of being forcibly returned to Rumania, he preaches against communism whenever he has the opportunity.

Since his arrival in the United States, Reverend Wurmbrand said, he has preached to all religious denominations: "The rank and file believe us, weep when they hear what is happening there \* \* \*." He continued:

When you arrive to the top leaders of churches, some either disbelieve you or ask you, beg you, not to speak.

\* \* \* \* \*

I have been asked, "Well, speak about Christ! We know that you are a very gifted preacher \* \* \*." I was told these very words: "Don't speak against communism, because this will make men hate the Communists and the Russians."

\* \* \* \* \*

Then I asked them, "How is it possible? Please explain it to me. How is it possible that you gave me exactly the same advice as the Communist secret police gave me?" They also told me, "Preach Christ and don't speak about communism."

Committee counsel read to Reverend Wurmbrand some of the statements recently made by Communists in their efforts to promote a "dialogue" between themselves and Christians. These statements expressed opposition to religious persecution and coercive methods aimed at religion. They also claimed that the Soviet Union had at no time passed laws to restrict freedom of conscience; that it guarantees religious liberty by law; and that no organ of Soviet power engages in antireligious propaganda.

Commenting on the above declarations, Reverend Wurmbrand testified that before the Communists came to power in Rumania they had "played also the role of being friends of religion."

"Everywhere," he said, "the Communists, until they have the power, say that they are the friends of religion."

Reverend Wurmbrand then produced documentary evidence to show what the Communists do "after they come to power."

Out of "hundreds of documents" he had in his possession (and left with the committee), Reverend Wurmbrand selected about 20 of the most recent articles from the Soviet press which demonstrated how the alleged "guarantee" of religious freedom works in the Soviet Union.

The articles were newspaper reports of trials of persons charged with alleged crimes against the state. In most instances the punishment meted out to individuals who persist in active religious practices is also revealed.

These documents—all published in the Soviet Communist press in 1966 and 1967—revealed that persons had been imprisoned for the following acts:

- Showing films of a religious nature to children;
- Distributing religious magazines;
- Baptizing children;
- Teaching religion to children.

Parents who persist in teaching their children about Christ are denied "parental rights"; the children are removed from their care and placed in state schools away from parental influence.

As Reverend Wurmbrand translated articles which told of children being taken from their parents, he was moved almost to the point of tears, saying:

I have known mothers from whom their children have been taken away. In a house which has been full with the noise, with the laughter, with the kicking of children, now there is a great silence of God.

I have seen these mothers; they were like bits of stone. You could not speak with them.

Six children taken away, and that is called "religious liberty," \* \* \*.

The documents translated by Reverend Wurmbrand revealed that brutal suppression and persecution of all religions is still the trademark of communism. These reports of trials and the punishment meted out to those who refuse to deny God were published by the Communists themselves in their government-controlled press. They contradict the statements advanced by such Communist theoreticians as Herbert Aptheker of the United States and Roger Garaudy of France as a basis for a "dialogue" with Christians.

As he finished translating the documents, Reverend Wurmbrand asked:

Now, in matters of communism, who knows communism better? *Pravda*, Kosygin, or Mr. Aptheker, the theoretician of the American Communist Party? Who of these should I believe? Aptheker should go to Mr. Kosygin, and they should convene what they should say.

It is said that witnesses were brought against Jesus at the trial, but what one witness said did not correspond with the other witness. I would recommend to the Communists, when they wish to lie, they should come together and convene how to lie.

They say, every one, another lie. The American Communists speak about religious liberty in Russia, but are disowned by their Russian comrades.

In his testimony, Reverend Wurmbrand also described the fate of the religious leaders of Rumania after the Communists took power.

He had been imprisoned with clergymen of the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths. "With us," he testified, "nearly all the Catholic bishops have been killed under tortures. Two or three, perhaps, have escaped." "In Rumania I have been in prison with Jewish rabbis. I could give their names." The Communists, he said, "make no distinction in persecuting religion."

In bringing charges against clergymen, Reverend Wurmbrand said that the actual crime is the instruction of children and youth about Christ, although the Communists "rarely say this."

At times, he said, clergymen are charged with theft. The amount of the Sunday collection must be reported to the government and pastors must get permission to use any of the money. If any money is used for church purposes without government sanction, the pastor is branded a thief.

Charitable work is forbidden, and the sale of Bibles is considered illicit commerce.

Catholic priests, he said, are often accused of sexual offenses if "girls come to confess to them. Lies are said, and they are put in prison. Others are accused of currency offenses or counterrevolutionary activity."

In its May 2, 1967, issue, *Look* magazine quoted Roger Garaudy, French Communist Party theoretician:

We [Communists] are told, "You offer your hand when you are not in power and your fist when you are in power." At the beginning, Marxism arrived in countries where Christianity was reactionary and was battled against as a political party and not as a religion. This fear of persecution has been spread by elements that are political and not religious.

When asked to comment on the Garaudy statement, Reverend Wurmbrand replied that—

the Communists don't bring any political accusation against those whom they have put in prison.

They say they have spread only religion. They don't accuse this Mrs. Sitsh [about whose prosecution Reverend Wurmbrand had testified] that she had said any counterrevolutionary words to her child. She has taught him the Gospel.

So they say they put men in prison for exclusively religious motives. \* \* \*

He then added:

I have been in a prison with the Communist leader of Rumania, Patrascanu, who brought communism to power in Rumania. He has been in the same cell with me and has been so tortured until he became mad. And then he was shot.

Ana Pauker, Vasile Luca, and other Communist leaders have been in the same prison with me.

They have put in prison those who brought them to power. I would suggest to Mr. Gus Hall and to Mr. Aptheker and to other American Communists, they should go to a church and pray to God, in whom they don't believe, that communism should never come to power in America, because as long as they have capitalism in America, they are free.

If communism comes to power, they are shot. In Russia, in Rumania, in Bulgaria, the Communists have killed the Communist leaders.

On the subject of "dialogue," Reverend Wurmbrand suggested that we should ask Roger Garaudy and Herbert Aptheker to—

go first to Moscow, to Peking, to Bucharest and dialogue with your own comrades and say that they should release all the Christian prisoners and that they should give the children back to their parents.

The dialogue, he said, "is a lie." To a statement by Archpriest Borovoi of Russia that his country was an example of "happy collaboration" between the Communist revolution and Christians, Reverend Wurmbrand replied:

We gave our backs, and they gave the whips. We gave our liberties, and they gave the jails. We gave our children, and they had the joy to bring them up in the atheistic manner. We gave our necks, and they gave the bullets for them. That has been the collaboration.

Reverend Wurmbrand also provided the committee with translations of two "doctrinal statements" on religion emanating from the Soviet Union in 1967:

The fight against religious remnants is \* \* \* an inseparable part of the entire ideological activity of the party organization. The party orients all its organization and its ideological institutions towards aggressive, atheistic activity. (*Pravda*, January 12, 1967.)

The second statement, published in the *Communist of the Armed Forces*, February 1967, declared:

Religion and scientific communism can have nothing in common nor be related to each other, as was proved by scholars of Marxism-Leninism. In the future all the forms of religion will be thrown on the rubbish heap of history.

### INVESTIGATIVE HEARINGS ON SUBVERSIVE INFLUENCES IN RIOTS, LOOTING, AND BURNING

On October 25, 26, and 31, and November 1, 28, 29, and 30, 1967, a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities held public hearings in Washington, D.C., on the subject of subversive influences in riots, looting, and burning.

#### Part 1

The subcommittee was composed of Hon. Edwin E. Willis, of Louisiana, chairman; Hon. William M. Tuck, of Virginia; Hon. Richard H. Ichord, of Missouri; Hon. John M. Ashbrook, of Ohio; and Hon. Albert W. Watson, of South Carolina. Hon. John C. Culver, of Iowa, was appointed October 25, 1967, as an associate member of the subcommittee to serve when Chairman Willis was unable to be present.

The purpose of the hearings was to determine "the extent to which, and the manner in which" acts of rioting, looting, and burning in various cities in the United States had been "planned, instigated, incited, or supported by Communist and other subversive organizations and individuals, and all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation."

On October 3, 1966, Chairman Willis had directed the committee staff to undertake a preliminary inquiry into the rioting, burning, looting, and other tragic acts of violence which have afflicted a number of principal cities in the United States. The chairman appointed Representatives Tuck and Watson to oversee the general conduct of the preliminary inquiry. Mr. Tuck rendered a report to the full committee on August 2, 1967, which clearly indicated that Communist and/or other subversive elements have been involved in acts of rioting, looting, and burning in the United States to a significant degree.

In his opening statement, Mr. Tuck stated that there had been "well over 100 riots" in the past few years, several dozen of which can be classified as "major disturbances." Property damage estimates were staggering, as were the cost—in the millions of dollars—of overtime for police and fire departments, mobilization of National Guard and Federal troops, in addition to millions of dollars in lost business in the riot-torn areas.

Congressman Tuck stated that while poverty, unemployment, discrimination, and lack of educational opportunity may be factors contributive to riots, these factors have existed both in this country and abroad in years past—and to a greater degree than in recent years—without rioting.

Mr. Tuck said:

It is not the view of this committee that Communists or other subversive elements are the sole cause of the recent riots; that without these elements there would have been no riots at all. \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

It is my personal view that those persons who have gone about counseling, urging, and advising so-called civil disobedience—which is no more than calculated violation of any law you do not like, the root of anarchy—have created disrespect and contempt for law and order which has contributed to the mob violence.

Congressman Tuck stressed that only 2 to 5 percent of the Negro population had taken part in the riots, and these figures represented a small minority of the total Negro population in America. He added that even this small minority was comprised, in significant part, by youths, teenage gangs, and persons with criminal records.

In his opening statement, Mr. Tuck also noted that other inquiries have been undertaken for the purpose of judging the factors contributing to the riots, but that the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Un-American Activities was limited to subversive activities (in the perspective of the riots) and would “not embrace social problems as such.”

Commenting on the historical aspects of riots, the Virginia Congressman said:

Throughout history riots have been used for political purposes. They can be, and have been, deliberately instigated to weaken and undermine existing governments and pave the way for the establishment of a new and different type of governmental system.

He pointed out that the 1960 Annual Report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities had stated:

There is considerable evidence that, in the United States, as well as on a world scale, the Communists feel that the present tactical situation calls for increased utilization of rioting and mob violence. \* \* \*

Mr. Tuck regretted that the committee analysis had proved to be accurate.

#### TESTIMONY OF ARCHIE MOORE

Former professional light heavyweight world boxing champion, Archie Moore, now a resident of San Diego, was the lead-off witness in the committee's hearings.

Mr. Moore, recipient of the 1968 outstanding citizen of San Diego award, stated that he did not see any sense in rioting and submitted a statement he had earlier delivered to the *San Diego Union*. The statement by the boxing champion was published as a page-one feature in that newspaper and stated in part:

Granted, the Negro still has a long way to go to gain a fair shake with the white man in this country. But believe this: If we resort to lawlessness, the only thing we can hope for is civil war, untold bloodshed, and the end of our dreams.

We have to have a meeting of qualified men of both races. Mind you, I said qualified men, not some punk kid, ranting the catch phrases put in his mouth by some paid hate-monger. There are forces in the world today, forces bent upon the destruction of America, your America and mine. And while we're on the subject, do you doubt for a minute that communism, world communism, isn't waiting with bated breath for the black and white Americans to turn on each other full force? Do you want a chance for life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness in the land of your birth, or do you want no chance at all under the Red heel?

In an elaboration of a program he started to combat juvenile delinquency—called ABC, Any Boy Can—Mr. Moore stated that:



A good student in the ABC class does not lie, steal, cheat, smoke, gamble, refuse to go to church, play hooky from school, get into trouble, participate in riots, throw bombs, smoke dope, smoke weeds, use narcotics of any kind, use LSD \* \* \*. We do teach them this is wrong.

Archie Moore gave positive statistics to point up the success of his ABC program among the youth. Damage from vandalism in a housing project dropped from "\$7,500 per month to less than \$70," after the program had been implemented for only 3 months; 350 vacant homes in the project were sold within 18 months because the youths worked fervently at keeping the housing project clean and lawns well groomed. Mr. Moore expressed hope that the ABC program could be implemented in cities all across the Nation.

Asked his opinion as to the cause of the racial riots in this country, the boxing champion said:

I would feel that there has been a lack of understanding of the Negroes' so-called problem, which actually is the white man's problem \* \* \*.

\* \* \* \* \*

They [the Negroes] are crying out about job opportunity more so than anything, then equal housing or equal opportunity to get housing, education. This is what they are crying out for.

#### TESTIMONY OF CLARENCE MITCHELL

Clarence Mitchell, director of the Washington Bureau of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), stated that he had been director of the Washington Bureau since 1950, and had begun his work with the well-known civil rights organization in 1945.

Mr. Mitchell, in his prepared statement, praised committee chairman Edwin E. Willis for courageously challenging the Ku Klux Klan.

In his statement, Mr. Mitchell said, "It is my opinion that it is an insult to the millions of law-abiding colored people to align them with the terrible destruction and violence that we have witnessed in some of our cities." He added, "It is my opinion that the vast majority of colored people in this country seek to settle their grievances and to achieve their objectives just as all other Americans, through the lawful channels of the land."

Mr. Mitchell noted that "Communists have never made any great headway in recruiting colored followers and they do not have any substantial following at this point."

The NAACP bureau director testified that his organization has instinctively avoided contacts with Communists. The NAACP had "an ironclad rule that we didn't want anybody who was Communist affiliated or an out-and-out Communist."

Further, Mr. Mitchell stated that the NAACP had launched a concerted campaign during the summer of 1967 to head off violence in various communities. He offered as sample exhibits several cards and bumper stickers, printed and distributed by the NAACP, which read:

KEEP COOL, Let the Other Guy BLOW HIS TOP  
THE OTHER SIDE WINS IF WE LOSE OUR COOL  
BRICKS THROUGH WINDOWS DON'T OPEN DOORS

The NAACP director said that it was his opinion that a "great deal of the turmoil in this country is fomented by the playing up of those

who are willing to say anything that is irresponsible for the purpose of getting on television or getting into the papers." He recalled getting a call from a lady who represented a reputable women's magazine. She asked Mr. Mitchell to "help her find a Negro who was a college graduate, who was disillusioned by the war in Vietnam, disillusioned about our domestic policy, and therefore had decided to become a sniper." The woman had been assigned to "keep looking for that particular kind of Negro" for a "Christmas story."

Mr. Mitchell stated that a Negro can get more publicity "if you talk about burning down the Capitol or wanting to do something violent and destructive \* \* \*. You can get a whole lot more publicity by doing that than you can get by these constructive things." (The witness was referring to Negroes who were helping to head off violence but who had received little or no publicity in doing so.)

#### TESTIMONY OF ASA T. SPAULDING

Mr. Asa T. Spaulding, president of North Carolina Mutual Life Insurance Company and a resident of Durham, N.C., was the next witness. Mr. Spaulding, a Negro, had started with the insurance company in 1932 and worked his way up from assistant secretary to comptroller to vice president by 1948 and finally to president in 1959.

The witness, a member of the board of directors of a number of large financial institutions and a trustee of Howard University and Shaw University, was a recipient of a Presidential citation in 1946 for his work in helping to stabilize the economy of the United States Government during World War II. Recently, he had returned from a trip to Africa as a member of a trade mission for the U.S. Department of Commerce, and had completed a tour of military installations in this country under the auspices of the Department of Defense.

In a personal statement to the committee, Mr. Spaulding said—  
there is no more burning issue facing the American public than that of Civil Rights.

Let no one be misled into believing that this is a phony issue which will go away if ignored, or that Communists are solely responsible for the current racial unrest and activity in this Country. \* \* \*

The insurance company executive added—

while I support all appropriate efforts to have America live up to the ideals and principles upon which the Nation was founded, I do not and cannot support and/or condone the wanton destruction of human life and property. I therefore oppose rioting, looting, and burning and consider them incompatible with the American system of government.

Mr. Spaulding then read a statement on his company's position in the current civil rights struggle. He stated:

I am of the opinion that Communists never miss an opportunity to capitalize on dissatisfaction, strife, and turmoil no matter what the cause. \* \* \* their alliances are more or less "marriages of convenience," subject to being dissolved when it will serve their interest to do so.

I, therefore, doubt that Communists "sincerely have the interests of the Negro at heart," or that they will work with the Negro in his efforts to achieve full equality \* \* \*.

#### STATEMENT OF WHITNEY M. YOUNG, JR.

Mr. Whitney Young, executive director of the National Urban League, was unable to appear before the committee on October 25,

1967. However, he submitted a statement which the chairman authorized to be inserted in the record. The statement read, in part:

In the light of the deaths, injuries, arrests, and destruction of Negro-owned property this past summer, it is obvious that the interests of Negro citizens are not advanced by riots. \* \* \*

In answer to the question concerning whether or not Communists sincerely have the interests of the Negro at heart, the Urban League's statement noted:

The Communist Party has spent much time and effort in wooing the Negro population, all to no avail. \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

There is little evidence that Communists have any significant influence on the civil rights movement. \* \* \*

### TESTIMONY OF EVELLE J. YOUNGER

The first witness of the afternoon session on Wednesday, October 25, 1967, was Mr. Evelle J. Younger, district attorney for Los Angeles County, Calif. Mr. Younger, a Nebraskan, received his A.B. and LL.B. degrees from the University of Nebraska and also did graduate work in criminology at Northwestern University.

Afterwards, Mr. Younger joined the FBI as a special agent where he worked until World War II. He then served with the Army's Counterintelligence Corps and the Office of Strategic Services for 4 years. He was recalled to duty during the Korean war and served with the Air Force in the Office of Special Investigation.

He had been deputy city attorney in the Criminal Division in the city government of Los Angeles, prosecuting attorney in the city of Pasadena, and on the municipal and superior courts in Los Angeles for 11 years before becoming district attorney in 1964.

Mr. Younger stated that his first major involvement with rioting was in 1965 during the Watts riot, when approximately 2,500 felony cases were prosecuted. The district attorney defined a riot as "thousands of people engaged in burning, looting, assault, and murder." A riot, he said, "involves a complete breakdown of law and order. \* \* \* it most certainly is one tremendous crime spree."

Commenting on his own experiences with rioters, he said:

We have been experiencing a number of actions by persons who resort to physically coercive methods to effect change which, in effect, amount to a repudiation of the orderly governmental process—professors and clergymen urging young men to resist military service; the editor of the UCLA student newspaper urging students to violate the laws against the use of marijuana; public figures advocating a refusal to pay taxes because the Government finances programs with which they disagree.

\* \* \* \* \*

When police are called upon to perform their duty to preserve order and protect life and property, they are often jeered, insulted, and spat upon by the very people they are paid to protect.

Screams of "police brutality" drown out those who urge higher standards of training and better pay and a higher degree of professionalization to produce better law enforcement. \* \* \*

Concerning technical developments in our society which affect a riot situation, Mr. Younger said:

Unquestionably, the television medium can be a major factor in contributing to or sustaining a riot. A newspaper can also do much to mold and influence public opinion over a period of time.

However, he noted:

Only TV can inspire immediate action—good or bad. TV can be the monster or the Jolly Green Giant, depending on how its power is used.

Mr. Younger said that the TV stations in the United States are licensed to be operated "in the public interest, necessity, and convenience." He added—

if Rap Brown is making an inflammatory speech before 20 people \* \* \* should TV come along and give him an audience of several million? \* \* \* is it in the public interest?

\* \* \* \* \*

When does TV stop reporting news and start creating news? At a recent Ku Klux Klan convention in southern California, there were literally more TV cameras present than delegates.

\* \* \* \* \*

Should rioters be able to use TV as a means of publishing battle orders?

The district attorney also related the circumstances of the Deadwyler case as an example of television playing a constructive role in keeping tempers calm by telecasting the entire 8 days of proceedings of the inquest.

Mr. Younger was asked his opinion of the basic factors necessary before a riot can take place. He replied that one prerequisite was hot, humid weather. Secondly, "there must exist a disadvantaged minority, a group that has been mistreated by the majority \* \* \*." The Los Angeles district attorney spoke about the mistreatment of the Irish and the Italians and the Chinese in this country, but said that since the Negro was not a voluntary immigrant, his resentment against mistreatment is logically greater.

A third factor which must exist before a riot can usually occur is tension between the races. Fourth, there must be the widespread disobedience of, and lack of respect for, law and order. When these "conditions" exist in sufficient degree, a riot will start, Mr. Younger testified.

The district attorney was of the opinion that "some Communists and extremists claim credit for starting certain of the recent riots, but they are just bragging."

He stated that the "riot-prone group" comprised only about 5 to 10 percent of the Negro population in the riot area and that most of these are "young and they are psychotic. Each is a potential killer."

Mr. Younger opined that these "racists, haters, political extremists, and agitators and the confirmed criminals are the real villains [in any riotous situation]. \* \* \* They comprise at most 20 percent of the participants in any modern American riot."

The Los Angeles district attorney continued—

after a riot starts, this group moves in fast and pours fuel on the flames and tries to make the riot as bloody, as damaging, and as extensive as possible. The fact is, though, that while this 20 percent could probably start a riot, they cannot sustain it. Only the remaining 80 percent of the 5 to 10 percent can sustain a riot, make it last anywhere from 24 hours to a week.

Mr. Younger explained step by step how, where, and when to start a riot. He gave the committee the procedure to bring the community temper almost to the boiling point—requiring then, merely the incident and the right time to trigger the riot.

He then commented on how to sustain the riot, stating:

I would then arrange for a TV commentator to bring a TV camera and crew and accompany me into the area selected as the site for the riot. \* \* \*

\* \* \* Find a black nationalist and ask him his reaction to the way the whites are buying up all the guns. \* \* \*

Then find another youth screaming, "Burn, baby, burn!" or "Get Whitey!" or some similar war cry. This kind always loves to go on TV and gets twice as wild when the filming starts. Before he goes on, ask him if he heard the rumor that 30 minutes before, in another area of the city, a white policeman shot and killed a Negro teenager for stealing a package of cigarettes from a drug store. Naturally, he will relate the rumor as fact on the air and scream a call to all blood brothers to arm themselves.

\* \* \* The crowd would be growing fast. I would have others phone in more false reports and get more police cars. The more the better. \* \* \*

By this time, I would have started an A-1, king-size, bloody riot!

Mr. Younger was asked if he had any suggestions toward eliminating or reducing the possibility of riots in the future. He replied:

First, we must insist that all Americans obey all our laws at all times, *period*. Not just the laws they like, but all laws, *period*. \* \* \*

\* \* \* Step II: Free the slaves. \* \* \* And we must be honest with the Negro and say we are not talking about equal cars or equal homes or equal salary, but equal opportunity.

In concluding his statement the Los Angeles district attorney said:

While we are working out our problems, let us get rid of our national inferiority complex. Government should cease its preoccupation with introspection and feelings of guilt and should stop espousing the idea that society is at fault for riots. This self-pity syndrome is extremely dangerous. Let us stop worrying about what the Russians and Chinese Communists will say about us. Let us say to the world: "Sure, we have problems—we have problems because our citizens, including Negro citizens, enjoy a higher degree of freedom than has been enjoyed in any other country in the history of the world. When we have trouble with a minority, we don't exterminate the minority. We try to solve the problem. Our system of government isn't perfect. It's just the best ever devised by man!"

The district attorney noted that his statement was not a criticism of television, but rather "a concern that television is so powerful that the potential for doing great damage during the riot is there."

He stated that the riot in the Watts section was caused or "sparked" by a particular incident—the false rumor that the police were beating a pregnant Negro woman.

While Mr. Younger stated that various agitational type groups were distributing pamphlets prior to the riot in Watts, he noted that these groups had been passing out literature since he, the witness, had graduated from high school.

He added:

There were no political overtones or implications in it [the riot in Watts] at that time. \* \* \* I wish that I had evidence, and it would be a nice thing if we could blame all the riots on the Communists, the black nationalists, or something like that. Then we could all go out and round them up and solve our problems. But it is not that easy.

The district attorney restated an earlier point made in his testimony: that the Communists and other extremist elements are quick to move in, once the riot starts, in order to exploit the disruption to their own ends.

## TESTIMONY OF ADRIAN H. JONES

The next witness, Adrian H. Jones of Washington, D.C., attended Gonzaga University in Spokane from 1937 through 1941. He was awarded a bachelor of science degree in military science from the University of Maryland in 1956 and received a master of arts degree in psychology from the University of Kansas in 1963. The witness has been studying for the past 4½ years in the sociology department of American University for a Ph. D. and is writing his dissertation on civil disturbances. His work at the university is being sponsored by its Center for Research in Social Systems.

Mr. Jones stated that, beginning in 1942, he had served in the U.S. Army for 20 years and retired in 1962 with the rank of lieutenant colonel, Military Police Corps.

The witness served two tours of duty in Europe and participated in the occupation of Japan from 1946 to 1949. He was the former commanding officer of the Harlem Military Police detachment, and former provost marshal of Ft. Leavenworth, Kans.

He is employed by the Center for Research in Social Systems of the American University where, for the past 4½ years, he has been engaged in research in the area of internal security, with special reference to rioting in foreign countries and also in the U.S.

Mr. Jones is coauthor of a study entitled "Combating Subversively Manipulated Civil Disturbances." He is guest lecturer at the International Police Academy and the International Association of Chiefs of Police.

The witness testified that "law enforcement has not been extensively researched" and due to the controversial nature of investigations into riots, his studies were systematically approached from three separate areas: (1) political subversion, (2) community conflict, and (3) the control of mobs and crowds. His study encompassed references from history, social science, police operations, and the news media.

Addressing the question of salient elements necessary for any riot, the witness noted that group hostility or antagonism, latent or active, "must be aroused to a high emotional stage in order to trigger a crowd to violent action."

Mr. Jones cited "dissident groups with real or imaginary grievances" as the chief basic component in a riot situation, adding that these groups may be subversive or nonsubversive.

Another essential element for a riot is the physiological crowd. These crowds may be "spontaneous, casual, or planned and intentional." Other important components essential to riots are: the agitator, who may or may not intend to trigger a riot; the precipitating incident, either accidental, spontaneous, natural, or developed; internal security forces brought in to try to control civil disturbances; and the general population of the community.

Mr. Jones told the committee that his research indicated, "Community conflicts, once they have begun, tend to resemble one another markedly." And also, he added, "The probability of social violence increases as the community conflict becomes more intense."

In determining the "character of a riot" it must be considered that "the subversive is interested in a riot for a political purpose." Normally, subversives do not hope to overthrow a government through one riot, "but they do see in a riot a means of weakening the existing power structure and of turning people against it."

The witness enumerated the factors which indicate a riot is subversively manipulated and noted that an analytical device or system had been developed in order to eliminate speculation on this point. The riot must be broken down into four phases and each phase analyzed separately.

The four riot phases are: (1) the precrowd phase, (2) the crowd phase, (3) the civil disturbance phase, and (4) the post-civil disturbance phase.

The precrowd phase he defined as a "preparatory period which is characterized by the development of antagonisms within a community between groups which have a different position on some economic, social, political, or other issue."

In the subversively manipulated riot, the precrowd phase is marked by: (a) the existence of a subversive organization used to create conflict; (b) selection of target groups "on the basis of the conflict potential in the community"; (c) preconditioning measures to influence the attitudes of target groups; (d) the acquisition and storage of weapons and explosives and the planning of escape routes for key individual leaders.

There cannot be a riot without a crowd which is "turned into a mob which throws aside all restraint and engages in collective social violence."

Subversive elements bent on starting a riot "may themselves insure that a crowd will be present" by planning a meeting or rally or "staging an incident" which will draw a crowd.

"Once the crowd is assembled, the subversives deploy their personnel in the crowd to agitate and excite it" by shouting slogans, circulating rumors, or making speeches.

The most vulnerable crowd is one which has been preconditioned in the aforementioned precrowd stage to react emotionally to certain slogans, phrases, and accusations.

In the civil disturbance, or actual riot phase, the witness noted, the highly excited crowd becomes a "mob which through a kind of emotional contagion engages in large-scale, collective social violence."

In a riot which is manipulated by subversives, "a booster incident will be initiated—rocks will be thrown, windows broken, a fire or fight started" and "sniping or looting" may also occur. "A martyr will be exploited or perhaps even created—someone who has been arrested, wounded, or killed by the riot-control forces or intentionally injured or killed by the subversives."

Mr. Jones, in answer to a question at this point in the testimony, stated that there is evidence that a formal organization exists that attempts to protect the very important subversive manipulators in order to preclude their being arrested.

The witness then went into the fourth stage or "post-civil disturbance phase" of the riot which is characterized as that "period when the violence is ended and social order has been restored."

If subversives are involved, evidence of efforts for additional violence will be noted by their continuance of propaganda and agitation. "Demands which the Government cannot possibly meet will be made."

The witness then directed his testimony to the question of counter-measures to the rioting and said:

The basic objective of internal security forces is to restore order, the corollary is to reestablish respect for law and order and public safety. \* \* \*

One of the techniques of controlling crowds is very solidly based upon the specific panic response which is expressed by individuals in the desire to escape or take flight from an immediate threatening area. \* \* \*

He noted that chemical munitions (i.e. tear gas) or streams of water directed at mobs cause persons to start thinking about themselves as individuals again. Usually this has the effect of dispersing the crowd.

Internal security forces should not be "overly identified with dissident segments of the community" since this can result in their underreacting against crowds. The reverse, or lack of identification, can result in overreaction by internal security forces.

In respect to countermeasures, the use of military forces in the control of riots and crowds has value because the units are highly trained and highly respected. As outsiders, moreover, they are not emotionally involved in the community conflict.

The witness felt that an intelligence collection system was a vital countermeasure in the precrowd phase, coupled with the maintenance of contact with dissident groups. Counterpropaganda and infiltration of subversive groups was also necessary.

Clues which signify the plotting of a riot may include: "the observation of known subversives moving into an area, the discovery of arms caches, the circulation of propaganda, attempts to hire demonstrators, attempts to train and orient agitators, arrangements for safe houses and escape routes."

Countermeasures, suggested by the witness, to an apparent plot to create a riot include—

either to disperse the crowd or to bring the crowd under control, to maintain contact with the leaders, and possibly to give the dissidents some sort of outlet.

Mr. Jones commented on countermeasures in the actual riot or civil disturbance phase and said:

The procedure of the United States Army is to first use a show of force; then to use riot-control formation; then to consider the use of streams of water; then the use of chemical agents; then fire by selected marksmen; and finally, under very extreme conditions, full fire power.

In the postdisturbance period, countermeasures include the use of intelligence in identifying the subversive agitators. During this period the authorities involved should listen to the complaints of members of dissident groups. It is equally important "to get information to the public to undercut the lies, half-truths, and rumors of subversives."

Riot-control forces should be instructed to avoid commitments that cannot be lived up to. Again Mr. Jones stressed the need for continued intelligence gathering to know what the subversives are doing. "Only then can effective countermeasures be planned."

The witness was apprised of current investigation and research by the committee which indicated that certain groups in the United States were actually advocating guerrilla warfare and insurgency in this country. He was asked if he saw a relationship between subversively manipulated riots and insurgency or guerrilla warfare. He answered that he felt that subversively manipulated riots are definitely a part of the political weapons system of the international Communist movement. The witness suggested that subversive elements in this



country had not exploited the manipulation of riots "to the extent that my research indicates they can be exploited."

At the close of his testimony, Mr. Jones indicated that he had begun his research prior to the rash of riots in the summer of 1964.

The witness made reference to the October 21, 1967, demonstrations at the Pentagon, stating:

I think there is certainly some evidence based upon my analytical scheme to support the contention that someone was trying to incite riotous violence in this particular instance.

#### TESTIMONY OF HERMAN D. LERNER

On Thursday, October 26, 1967, the subcommittee convened and received the testimony of Herman D. Lerner of Bethesda, Md. Mr. Lerner studied natural and social sciences at the University of Maryland until his studies were interrupted in 1943-46 for a term of military service. He served as a combat infantryman and later as administrative aide in the war rooms of the general staff of the 103d Infantry Division and the 3d Armored Division during operations in the European theater.

After receiving his A.B. degree in 1948, Mr. Lerner did graduate work at Harvard University, where he was a teaching fellow in social change. Since then he has done additional graduate work at the American University.

From 1951 to 1952 he was employed by Harvard University and shortly thereafter started his career as a researcher and consultant in behavioral and social sciences. For the past 14 years the witness has been conducting studies of military systems, research planning and utilization, social and economic issues, and political trends.

Mr. Lerner is a member of various professional associations in operations research, sociology, management, and general science. For the past several years he has been visiting lecturer at the International Police Academy in Washington, D.C. (run by the Agency for International Development) on the subject of crowd and mob psychology and the causes and characteristics of riots.

Concerning fields of study related to organized rioting, the witness stated that during the past 10 years he had studied subjects relating to "national cohesion, military strategy, general and limited warfare, political rioting, crime, and internal security, with special reference to military-civilian relations, force, propaganda, and strategy."

Commenting particularly on an Office of Naval Research study on riots he had worked on, the witness said:

As for the possibility of rioting as a tactic in general warfare, this was a problem which the study team looked into since it was believed that there would be enormous destruction during a thermonuclear war and that military units might be required to cope with many emergencies, including threats to naval installations and internal security which might arise from political rioting and insurgencies.

The witness listed five headings under which an analysis of recent urban rioting in the United States could be classified: (1) urban disorganization and poverty, (2) community conflict (social, religious, economic, ethnic, racial, et cetera), (3) criminality and delinquency, (4) domestic subversion, (5) foreign subversion.

By the classification "urban disorganization and poverty," the witness meant "all those physical, cultural, social, and economic characteristics of city life which are associated with slums or ghettos."

"Community conflict" referred to "any strife between two or more groups within a community over social, religious, economic, ethnic, racial, or political issues," Mr. Lerner stated.

The category "criminality and delinquency" referred to the "various forms of antisocial behavior which are in violation of the law," he said.

These "first three subjects," the witness noted, "have two major kinds of significance for subversion: exploitability and fertility."

The witness defines subversion as "any activity which has as its objective the illegal displacement of power from one group to another; \* \* \* the weakening or destruction of national cohesion through propaganda, military and industrial sabotage, or other economic or political measures."

He added: "Subversion is political criminality."

Drawing a distinction between domestic and foreign subversives, Mr. Lerner said:

A domestic, or "benign" subversive is a person whose disloyalty, alienation, and illegal activity are directed against our national institutions, including our political structure and the incumbents of power, but whose loyalty and allegiance to the Nation—as a people—are still intact.

\* \* \* \* \*

A foreign or "malignant" subversive, on the other hand, is a person who is uncommitted to the Nation and who may in fact be an agent of a foreign power with primary allegiance to that power.

Turning to the circumstances under which political rioting occurs, the witness explained that three subjects must be considered here: (1) the functions of government; (2) how those functions are defined or interpreted by the persons governed; and (3) organized exploitation of real or alleged governmental inadequacies and injustices.

In answer to the query of how "people react to organized exploitation of the failure of governmental authority and power, either real or alleged," the witness replied:

The most important determinant of this reaction is the set of basic attitudes and sentiments which people already have concerning the Government.

\* \* \* \* \*

An urban Negro in a low-income group in the U.S. is unlikely to compare himself with an urban Russian or an urban Chinese or \* \* \* a man in Harlem ordinarily will not compare himself with one in Watts, and vice versa.

\* \* \* But he is more likely to view himself with other nearby Negroes who have more than he or with nearby whites \* \* \*.

This sense of comparative or relative deprivation which results from consistently unfavorable comparisons causes frustration, which in turn may lead to aggressive tendencies \* \* \*.

The witness observed that authorities in the field of crowds, mobs, and riots had denoted "features of aggressive group action which are noteworthy for an understanding of recent urban rioting in the United States."

These include:

- (a) weakening of customary restraints or inhibitions which ordinarily block illegal behavior and overtly aggressive action against authorities;
- (b) moral support for aggressive action from other participants in the group;
- (c) reinforced or increased power of the individual;
- (d) intensification of the influence of what might be called negative or antisocial norms; \* \* \*

External characteristics of group behavior in riots include: mental homogeneity, emotionality, irrationality, tendencies for growth, and spirals of emotion and aggression.

Subjective characteristics of group behavior in riots include: nervous tension, a feeling of anonymity, decline in sense of responsibility, impression of universality, regression, and the narrowing of perception.

The witness reviewed the steps or stages in the development from a psychological point of view. These stages are: the preconditioning or propaganda stage, a feeling of resentment over unjust deprivation stage, the assembly or crowd-forming stage, the "riot-inciting idea or incident," and finally the riot.

The riot has several kinds of significance to the participants, including "physical and symbolic redress, or righting, of injustice" through damage, looting, or burning, which "symbolizes the punishment of the guilty," and the "power holders and others identified with the established order."

Following the riot, the political goal of the rioter—ordinarily an increase in legitimate power (actual or symbolic)—either is achieved or not achieved.

Mr. Lerner then stated:

These stages should be understood as general concepts which help describe much of the recent political rioting. They do not necessarily apply to all cases. \* \* \* Also, guerrilla units—one person or small groups—may take advantage of the riot by sniping and by other specialized acts of theft, destruction, and terror.

Mr. Lerner was asked if he found evidence of subversion in political rioting. He replied, "Yes. There is no question about it." He cited examples from the congressional testimony of J. Edgar Hoover, FBI Director, regarding subversion in certain riots in the United States. He said it was also documented by evidence from congressional committees and added:

But even if we were to cast aside the official information such as that which I have just quoted \* \* \* there would be no question about the existence of subversion in recent urban rioting because the acts of many of the rioters—individually and collectively—are themselves subversive.

Mr. Lerner stated that there "are definite patterns which are repeated over and over again in subversively manipulated riots and in their development." He cited as examples the "frequent, systematic repetition of \* \* \* standardized events, styles, and sequences in widely dispersed areas" such as Watts and Harlem. He also cited long-range hopes and plans of individuals, stated orally or in writing, that riots would occur in the United States. Mr. Lerner read an excerpt from *The Crusader*, monthly newsletter of Robert F. Williams, exiled leader of the Revolutionary Action Movement.

The witness reiterated an earlier pattern in political riots, the involvement of young people. He said, "Resentful and unhappy young people can be stimulated to violent action with relative ease."

Mr. Lerner pointed out the involvement of teenage gangs in riots and added:

Youths are more suggestible and impressionable \* \* \* are more readily disposed to physical responses to frustration \* \* \* more idealistic, more highly sympathetic to the underdog, and more highly displeased over apparent deficiencies in the social structure than adults.

All of these characteristics make youths a good target for propaganda by those who may wish to represent themselves as sincere, legitimate reformers or idealistic revolutionaries.

Mr. Lerner presented his suggestions for dealing with riot situations. He divided his recommendations into (a) "emergency steps" and (b) "long-term programs." He said: "Emergency steps are those which should be taken immediately at the threat or outbreak of a riot."

Among the long-term recommendations, the witness recommended the following:

- (1) Make ethnic "hate" activities a Federal offense \* \* \*
- (2) Impose limited weapons control [on subversives and criminals] \* \* \*
- (3) Formulate a set of civil duties which corresponds to civil rights \* \* \*
- (4) \* \* \* selectively and temporarily reducing rights to speech and assembly of subversives \* \* \*
- (5) \* \* \* devise specific, workable programs for bringing the quality of Negro life in this country to an acceptable level \* \* \*
- (6) Provide a program for rehabilitation of subversives and insurgents \* \* \*
- (7) Consider the advisability of broadening the mandate of this committee [House Committee on Un-American Activities] \* \* \* to encompass increased constructive action toward dealing with the conditions which create subversives in this country and toward rehabilitation of subversives.

Further discussion on the definition and classification of subversives followed.

Mr. Lerner said:

One key to a solution of this definition and classification problem is whether or not what is being done is consistent with, or opposed to, local ordinances. Another key is motive. Still another is effect.

Speaking of the "damage inflicted on Negroes or on Negroes' property" in the riots, Mr. Lerner said that "we should understand that middle-class and wealthy Negroes are a symbol of authority and an object of aggression to lower-class Negroes just as whites are."

The witness added:

It is true that it would be an oversimplification to state that the riots are just the result of generations of disadvantage or to state that we are victims of the past and nothing more. \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

But it would be unrealistic and almost meaningless to think of compensation for the deprivations of past generations. Other groups besides Negroes also could make lists of past deprivations and grievances. \* \* \* We can try to arrive at equitable settlements only within the framework of living generations.

At the conclusion of his testimony Mr. Lerner said:

Let the people decide whether the situation today is dangerous enough, whether the kinds of things we are talking about are in themselves intrinsically dangerous enough, to warrant \* \* \* laws and \* \* \* limitations, if you will, of freedom of speech.

We already limit other abuses of speech such as obscenity, libel, and contempt. In fact, in criminal libel, even the truth is not always a defense. And the Supreme Court at one time upheld an Illinois law against hate activity in a case involving a white supremacist. Therefore, it may be feasible to draw up a constitutional and effective statute on ethnic incitement.

#### TESTIMONY OF HON. SAM YORTY

On Tuesday, November 28, 1967, the subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met to continue its public hearings into subversive influences in riots, looting, and burning.

The first witness, the Honorable Sam Yorty, mayor of Los Angeles, had served in the California Legislature in 1936-40. He was an intelligence officer in the Air Force from 1942 to 1945 and had again

served in the California Legislature in 1949. He was a Member of Congress from 1950 to 1954 and has been mayor of Los Angeles since 1961.

His tenure in the California Legislature in the mid-1930's gave him an opportunity to study the subject of communism, and since that time the witness has maintained an interest in Communist activities.

In answer to a question concerning his opinion of underlying factors which caused the riots in the last few years, Mayor Yorty replied:

I would certainly say that one of the factors is the constant repetition of subversive propaganda, the agitation and propaganda conducted by the Communist Party within the framework of their historic objective to break down the respect for government, certainly for law and order, and to personalize, as they always do, this objective mainly in the police officer.

Asked if he believed these riots had been spontaneous or planned, the mayor said:

I think that there are some of both. \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*  
I think that the propaganda over the years has been so constant and at times very effective \* \* \*.

I also think there are some riots where subversive forces have actually planned \* \* \* incidents that they would hope would spark a riot.

Mr. Yorty produced as an exhibit for the record a pamphlet entitled "The Big Lie," which he had prepared as mayor of Los Angeles and which contained a short history of the charges of police brutality extending over a period of 21 years—since 1946—by the Communist Party.

The witness stated that law enforcement has been handicapped "by the reinterpretation, really the rewriting of the Constitution by the United States Supreme Court \* \* \*." He cited as examples of such "rewriting" the exclusionary rule of evidence, the rules of search and seizure, and the registration of known criminals.

Mayor Yorty recalled that Lenin had made reference to "police brutality" in his writings as early as 1902, and noted that he knew of no period in history when the "campaign against the police has been quite as effective as it is today."

The mayor was asked if police brutality charges were made in his city during the Watts riot, and he replied that an attempt was made "to blame the police for the rioting," and added:

This led to my unpleasant confrontation with Dr. Martin Luther King. \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*  
he persisted in arguing that the police were to blame for the rioting. Then he went out and got before the cameras and newspapers and made that same charge. I felt it necessary to answer that charge and to tell him that it was very unfair for him to come out to Los Angeles and try to blame the police for the rioting.

Mayor Yorty then stated that he did not "know of any case where an officer has had to be dismissed for brutality."

The mayor noted that there were many people who made charges of police brutality whose motive was to discredit the police department and to carry on the so-called Communist struggle campaign to "break down respect for the law enforcement officials and \* \* \* eventually \* \* \* break down the ability of our Government to operate."

The Los Angeles mayor said that:

Unfortunately, the nature of news is \* \* \* usually negative. The bizarre makes more news than the everyday hard work of law enforcement.

Mayor Yorty testified to the need for people to understand the Communist Party and its apparatus. He said:

The public has been conditioned to feel that the charge of communism is some kind of smear on innocent people. \* \* \*

He cited several examples of Communist "conditioning" of the American public "until they have lost their understanding of the true effectiveness of Communist agitation and propaganda."

The witness submitted that he "wouldn't want to go so far as to say that no policeman has ever been guilty of brutality," but that "the major problem is brutality to police on the part of citizen groups."

In responding to a question on whether riot legislation should be levied at the State or Federal level, the mayor, who is an attorney, said:

I think you have to take whatever action you can at every level. I don't think trying to maintain law and order is just a matter for any one level of government.  
\* \* \*

The mayor commented on the Communist-manipulated demonstration against the President on June 23, 1967, in Los Angeles. He noted that the "police permit for the so-called parade was issued to a person who has been identified as a Communist." The parade was slated as a demonstration against the war in Vietnam, but, as the mayor noted, the "war in Vietnam just happens to be the current issue that the Communists use to try to cause citizens to confront policemen and to defy them."

The mayor also noted that the demonstration reached riot or near-riot proportions.

Don Healey, former husband of one of the leaders of the Communist Party in California, Dorothy Healey, was the identified Communist who had obtained the parade permit for the riotous demonstration on June 23, 1967, in Los Angeles.

Prior to the clashes with the police on June 23, about 10,000 persons had paraded past the hotel where President Johnson was speaking. As the parade reached the hotel, elements in the front ranks stopped. Police were ordered to disperse the crowd on the grounds that the parade permit stated that the marchers were to be in continuous movement. Hard-core agitators at the rear of the crowd pressed the marchers in front causing them to spill over into the ranks of police. This action led to clashes.

The mayor said that the people in America did not understand the Communist theory of the struggle. He added:

We have a constant series of struggles in this country, all the time conducted, of course, in most cases by legitimate and sincere people who will never understand that they have become part of the struggle.

The June 23 demonstrations in Los Angeles were organized and sponsored by the Peace Action Council. The chairman of this Peace Action Council is Irving Sarnoff, a fifth amendment witness who appeared before this House committee on September 5, 1958. Sarnoff had been identified in a committee report as a member of the district council of the Southern California District of the Communist Party.

The mayor then quoted from the Communist Party's *Manual on Organization*. The passages from the manual documented how the Communists try to take advantage of a movement in the country, such as the current civil rights movement.

Mayor Yorty stated:

I think it is rather apparent that over the long years the Negro people did not prove very susceptible to Communist propaganda and agitation \* \* \*.

But I do think that in the civil rights movement today there is a growing success on the part of the Communist apparatus to manipulate some of the organizations. \* \* \*

The Los Angeles mayor was asked if he had any recommendation, in addition to antiriot legislation, which might help solve the problem of rioting and looting.

He indicated that some action was required in the nature of reversing recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions which have restricted "the ability of law enforcement agencies to do their job."

The chairman, Mr. Willis, and members of the committee expressed their gratitude to Mayor Yorty for his excellent contribution to the subject under investigation.

#### OCTOBER 31, 1967, HEARING

The subcommittee met on October 31, 1967, to receive in evidence three exhibits which had been prepared by the committee staff.

Committee Exhibit No. 1, "International Communist Statements on Racial Agitation and Riots in the United States," was a compilation of statements on civil rights, the condition of Negroes, and riots in the United States published or broadcast by the Soviet Union, by Communist China, by American Communists residing in China and various Chinese Communist officials, and similar statements emanating from Communist Cuba and also North Vietnam.

This exhibit documented the fact that the line of the above-named Communist nations was to support, advocate, and justify racial rioting and also to disseminate statements designed to inflame Negroes against the United States. Any racial agitation and riot provocation carried out by Communist groups in this country, therefore, would be in conformity with the position of these Communist powers.

*Vietnam Courier*, for example, the official newspaper of the Communist government of North Vietnam, had stated in its issue of August 29, 1966:

The first front against U.S. imperialism is Vietnam.

The second front lies in the United States.

\* \* \* the [U.S.] Afro-Americans \* \* \* have realized \* \* \* that to achieve freedom and equality they must oppose revolutionary violence to counter-revolutionary violence, just as the Vietnamese are doing. \* \* \*

Attacked on both fronts, the U.S. imperialists will certainly be defeated and victory will surely belong to the American and Vietnamese peoples.

Committee Exhibit No. 2, "FBI Statements on Communist Racial Agitation," is a compilation of excerpts from FBI Annual Reports and the testimony of J. Edgar Hoover in his annual appearances before House Appropriations subcommittees on the subject of Communist penetration of the civil rights movement, Communist racial agitation, and the Communist position on riots.

These quotations document the fact that for a period of years prior to the outbreak of the riots, the U.S. Communist Party had conducted a campaign of infiltrating the civil rights movement and inflaming racial tensions and animosity.

The FBI's Annual Report for 1966, for example, stated:

Exploitation of racial unrest in the United States continues to be a major program of the Communists. During the year, the Party issued numerous directives through its National Negro Commission instructing members to participate in the civil rights movement and to be alert to the provocation of militant action among Negroes.

In his 1967 testimony, Mr. Hoover stated:

The riots and disturbances of recent years have given Communists a golden opportunity to emphasize the Marxist concept of the "class struggle" by identifying the Negro and other minority group problems with it. Communists seek to advance the cause of communism by injecting themselves into racial situations and in exploiting them (1) to intensify the frictions between Negroes and whites to "prove" that the discrimination against minorities is an inherent defect of the capitalist system, (2) to foster domestic disunity by dividing Negroes and whites into antagonistic, warring factions, (3) to undermine and destroy established authority, (4) to incite Negro hostility toward law and order, (5) to encourage and foment further racial strife and riotous activity, and (6) to portray the Communist movement as the "champion" of social protest and the only force capable of ameliorating the conditions of the Negroes and the oppressed.

The cumulative effect of almost 50 years of Communist Party activity in the United States cannot be minimized, for it has contributed to disrupting race relations in this country and has exerted an insidious influence on the life and times of our Nation. As a prime example, for years it has been Communist policy to charge "police brutality" in a calculated campaign to discredit law enforcement and to accentuate racial issues. The riots and disorders of the past 3 years clearly highlight the success of this Communist smear campaign in popularizing the cry of "police brutality" to the point where it has been accepted by many individuals having no affiliation with or sympathy for the Communist movement.

The net result of agitation and propaganda by Communist and other subversive and extremist elements has been to create a climate of conflict between the races in this country and to poison the atmosphere.

The contents of Committee Exhibits 1 and 2 made it clear that Communists abroad, as well as those in this country, were trying to merge the civil rights and peace-in-Vietnam issues.

Committee Exhibit No. 3 contained background data on various organizations which, committee research and investigation indicated, had been engaged in racial agitation. These data included, in all cases, statements contained in official publications of the organizations and/or statements by their leaders.

The general counsel of the committee stated in reference to the material contained in this exhibit:

Because some of these organizations are relatively new and others are small and little known, the subcommittee has agreed that staff documents containing basic data about these organizations and also statements which they or their recognized leaders have made concerning riots, the use of violence, and related issues should be made a part of the record.

He stated that the purpose of inserting the staff papers was "to make the record clear," adding:

When facts are presented about these organizations and individuals in these hearings, the general nature of the groups will be known and understood. \* \* \*

He emphasized that the documents to be presented were "not intended to convey any more than they actually say." He noted that some of the organizations were openly Communist and subver-



sive, while "others have been cited as Communist and/or subversive by official agencies." Still others had not been cited. The inclusion of data about these groups "is not to be interpreted as a committee finding or implication that the organization is Communist or subversive."

Committee Exhibit No. 3 contained characterizations of the following organizations:

Communist Party of the United States of America (CPUSA)

W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America (DCA)

*Freedomways* (magazine)

Progressive Labor Party (PLP)

Socialist Workers Party (SWP)

Workers World Party (WWP)

Youth Against War and Fascism (YAWF)

Spartacist League

Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM)

Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (also known as SNCC, SNICK)

Southern Student Organizing Committee (SSOC)

Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc. (SCEF)

*Liberator* (magazine)

ACT

Organization for Black Power

Freedom Now Party

Congress of Racial Equality (CORE)

Nation of Islam (NOI)

Following the introduction of these exhibits, Mr. Robert H. Mehaffey, a staff employee, read excerpts from Committee Exhibit No. 3 into the record.

#### Part 2—New York City (Harlem Riot)

On October 31 the subcommittee continued its hearings to receive testimony concerning the Harlem, New York City, riot of July 1964, the role of subversive elements in the riot, their agitational activities preceding the riot, and also similar actions carried out from the time the riot ended to the date of the hearing.

#### TESTIMONY OF ADOLPH W. HART

The first witness was Detective Adolph W. Hart of the New York City Police Department.

Detective Hart, a Negro, had been an undercover agent for the police department in the Chinese Communist-oriented Progressive Labor Movement (PLM), since renamed the Progressive Labor Party (PLP).

Detective Hart, a PLM member for several months prior to the Harlem riot of 1964, testified that he had attended classes organized by PLM where he was taught Marxism, urban guerrilla warfare tactics, and methods of hampering riot-control forces. He became acquainted with William Epton, chairman of the Harlem chapter of the Progressive Labor Movement, through these classes.

The witness told the subcommittee that he had become familiar with a printing company, Tri-Line Offset Co. Inc., which produced the

official PLM magazine, *Progressive Labor*, and other "leftist literature." The company was owned by three members of the Progressive Labor Movement. He stated that he wrote articles for *Progressive Labor* and for the PLM newspaper, *Challenge*.

Mr. Hart identified various members of the Harlem Club of PLM and gave a chronological rundown of PLM meetings and agitational activities—including its formation of the Harlem Defense Council—leading to the 1964 Harlem riot.

On the day the riot started, July 18, 1964, he attended a Harlem street-corner meeting organized by Progressive Labor, held about 2 hours before the outbreak of the riot. The witness offered the transcript of remarks made at this rally by William Epton who, in a highly inflammatory speech, told the crowd of 300 that "we're going to have to kill a lot of these cops, a lot of these judges \* \* \*."

On July 19, the day after the riot started, the witness attended a meeting of the PLM-created Harlem Defense Council. At the meeting, which preceded the resumption of the rioting on that day, it was suggested that the group attempt to lure a police officer into a side street where he would be killed as a form of retaliation against the police department. At this same meeting, William McAdoo, a PLM member, told of plans to print a leaflet showing how to make a Molotov cocktail with an empty soda bottle and a rag.

Mr. Hart said that William Epton entered the room during the July 19 meeting and stated "that another riot should be organized on the Lower East Side, which would spread out the police force and keep them from suppressing the riot in the Harlem area."

The witness offered a number of exhibits which related to his testimony concerning PLM and its role in the 1964 Harlem riot. Epton had been indicted in July 1964 and later convicted of advocacy of criminal anarchy. Eleven other PLM members were convicted on similar charges.

Detective Hart was asked to comment on a claim by William Epton that he spoke for the Negro people. He stated:

I can only say that Epton and people like him speak only for a small disillusioned segment of un-American misfits—rabblers, who would like to see America fall into the hands of communism.

The responsible black man today wants a change, but he has enough faith in this country to change it through the ballot, which he is doing every day. He has proven and continues to prove his loyalty to this country—and in no uncertain terms—by his outstanding record in Vietnam.

He realizes that it is no longer impossible to become a black sheriff, a black mayor, a black Supreme Court Justice, and that it is quite possible he can even be elected President in the not too distant future.

The witness testified that he believed the July 18, 1964, Progressive Labor Movement-sponsored meeting was the "triggering device or the catalyst" which sparked the Harlem riot.

#### TESTIMONY OF PHILLIP A. LUCE AND JUDITH WARDEN

On October 24, 1967, the members of the committee voted to make public certain portions of the executive testimony of Mr. Phillip Abbott Luce and Miss Judith Warden received on June 8 and 9, 1965. Mr. Luce and Miss Warden had both been members of the Progressive Labor Party. Mr. Luce, who had been a member from approximately July 1964 until January 1965, had been an editor of *Challenge*, official

newspaper of PLP. Miss Warden, also an editor of *Challenge*, had joined PLP a few months previous to Mr. Luce and also left the organization in January 1965.

The committee staff director read those portions of the Luce/Warden testimony which were relevant to the topic of the hearings, namely, the involvement of the Progressive Labor Party in the 1964 Harlem riot.

The released executive testimony of Mr. Luce and Miss Warden corroborated the testimony of Detective Hart in pinpointing PLM as the primary catalyst in helping to initiate and prolong the 1964 Harlem riot.

#### TESTIMONY OF HERBERT ROMERSTEIN

In the afternoon session of the hearings of October 31, 1967, Herbert Romerstein, an investigator for this committee, stated that he had conducted a background investigation into the events leading up to the Harlem riot.

He noted that racial and antipolice agitation had taken place for many years in New York. This agitation, Mr. Romerstein observed, was—

developed by the various organizations within the Communist periphery—the Communist Party itself, as well as other organizations affiliated with the Communist Party and, subsequently, organizations of the Red Chinese-oriented Communists, such as the Progressive Labor Party and organizations affiliated with it.

Mr. Romerstein declared that the Communist Party had very little success in gaining recruits among the Negro working class in the past. He added:

But we have suddenly seen a new approach by the Communists. Rather than attempting to win over Negro workers whom they have been unsuccessful with, there is now an attempt to win over another segment of the Negro population, a segment which exists in every population, the juvenile delinquent and semi-criminal element. \* \* \*

The committee investigator introduced documents which revealed "police brutality" agitation by the Communists from 1948 on in this country. He made specific references to Progressive Labor publications which were disseminated in the months prior to, during, and after the 1964 Harlem riot. These publications deliberately couched police brutality allegations within a propaganda framework. The headlines, "POLICE WAR ON HARLEM," "COPS TRIGGER TWO MORE MURDERS," "COPS BEAT PICKETS IN THIRD ST. 'WAR,'" were indicative of the type of inflammatory literature which was distributed by PLM.

The witness told of a rally of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) which was held shortly after—and only a few blocks away from—the PLM rally of July 18, 1964, the day the riot started.

The CORE rally, aforementioned, actually served to bring a large crowd marching down to the police station in Harlem for a confrontation with the police.

Mr. Romerstein told the subcommittee of the statement of rent strike leader Jesse Gray made at a July 19, 1964, meeting of various Harlem-based militant organizations after the first night of rioting. The committee investigator stated:

He called for a hundred skilled black revolutionaries who are ready to die to correct what he called the police brutality situation in Harlem. He said, "There is only one thing that can correct the situation, and that is guerrilla warfare."

Jesse Gray was a fifth amendment witness before this committee in 1960 and had been identified in sworn testimony as the former organizer in Harlem for the Communist Party.

James Farmer, then CORE director, made a speech at this same meeting (which he repeated later the same day over station WABC-TV) that he was an eyewitness to a shooting by a policeman in Harlem of a Negro woman who had merely asked him for directions out of the riot area. Farmer later admitted—long after his inflammatory statement had had its effect—that he had only been told about the incident which, after investigation, proved to have never taken place.

Farmer's statement was quoted in a black nationalist magazine and was accepted as factual until months later when it was proved to be nothing more than a rumor.

Mr. Romerstein disclosed that the Lower East Side Club of Progressive Labor refused to trigger a second, supporting riot (during the Harlem disturbance) in their area of New York City "because they felt that they only had a small percentage of the juvenile delinquents \* \* \*" on the Lower East Side.

The committee investigator asserted that the Harlem 1964 riot was a classic example of a Communist-manipulated civil disorder.

Mr. Romerstein offered for insertion into the record the criminal contempt citations by New York County authorities against five members of the Progressive Labor Movement who had refused to answer the questions of a New York grand jury investigating the Harlem riot, even though the grand jury voted to confer immunity upon them for any crimes that might have been revealed by their testimony.

#### TESTIMONY OF RAYMOND WOOD

On November 1, 1967, subcommittee hearings resumed to receive further testimony relating to rioting in the New York City area from Detective Raymond Wood, a member of the New York City Police Department.

In April 1964, Detective Wood, assigned to the Bronx section of New York City, had joined the Bronx chapter of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE).

He testified that in July 1964, following the riot, he, Herbert Callender, leader of the Bronx CORE chapter, and John Valentine, of the same chapter, attempted to make a "citizen's" arrest on the mayor. The three were subsequently arrested.

Detective Wood told of meeting, on December 14, 1964, Robert Collier, an ex-member of the Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM). The witness testified about his conversation with Collier pertaining to the latter's need to obtain a list of technical books for Major Ernesto "Che" Guevara, then a member of Cuba's U.N. delegation. Mr. Wood agreed to help Collier obtain the books.

Collier told the witness that he was interested in forming a "Black Liberation Front." The former RAM member described to Mr. Wood how to fire mortars onto a police station. He also disclosed a plan to obtain arms from New York State armories. Collier also had a plan for an alliance with "French Liberation forces," a Canadian activist group, to obtain "plastique" explosives.

The former RAM member also hoped to persuade the leadership of the all-Negro Freedom Now Party to become a "front organization for the Black Liberation Front."

Mr. Wood detailed Collier's plan to blow up docks along the New York City waterfront and the Statue of Liberty. Plans were also discussed among members of the RAM front to blow up the Liberty Bell and the Washington Monument.

The witness stated that Robert Collier, Walter Bowe, and Khaleel Sayyed were all convicted in the conspiracy. A fourth member, Michelle Duclos, turned "state's evidence" and was subsequently deported to Canada.

The police detective concluded his testimony by saying that Robert Collier had formulated his plans to blow up the docks and national monuments in order to help create a situation of guerrilla warfare in the United States by showing young Negroes who wished to fight that somebody was prepared to take positive violent action. Collier hoped that these young Negroes could be recruited for guerrilla warfare or for future riot activity. According to Detective Wood: "At one point, he [Collier] stated that when the next riot takes place it's not gonna be something with the cops breaking heads, we're gonna have our chance to break heads."

#### TESTIMONY OF HERBERT ROMERSTEIN—Resumed

On November 1, 1967, committee investigator Romerstein resumed his testimony concerning the riot situation in New York City. His testimony was directed to the post-1964 riot period and outlined the activities of various organizations which had continued to foster discord among the races and which had continued to circulate highly inflammatory literature designed to maintain a high degree of racial tension in the New York area.

The committee investigator noted that "Progressive Labor continued its agitational activity after the Harlem riot." He introduced several exhibits which graphically documented the postriot propaganda activity of the Progressive Labor Movement.

Mr. Romerstein testified briefly regarding the East Harlem disturbances in 1967. He recalled that the altercation was termed "minor" in terms of the number of participants and the extent of the damage.

Mr. Romerstein emphasized the point that a "relative handful" of people "trained and prepared to commit acts of violence can always be considerably more dangerous than a large mob that has no direction and that can be controlled by the police."

Mr. Romerstein reported in his testimony on the activities of the Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM) in this country in order to further demonstrate how far a small handful of individuals, dedicated to violence, can go toward disrupting society. He cited the police-aborted plot by RAM members to assassinate moderate Negro leaders as one example of the determination of RAM members to disrupt American society.

The witness described the backgrounds of certain RAM members in order to show that, for the most part, these individuals were highly educated—one member was an assistant principal of a school in New York City—and held "extremely good white-collar jobs."

Mr. Romerstein noted that a Black Arts Theater in New York City had been a recipient of Federal poverty funds. The theater, discovered to have been a storage house for weapons, had once produced a play instructing Negroes in methods of slaying white persons.

The witness went on to cite examples of continued organized propaganda activity in and around the Harlem area in the postriot period (July 1964 to the present). He cited examples of agitation by groups such as:

SNCC (Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee), whose director of international affairs, James Foreman, had called for various Afro-Asian U.N. delegations to put direct and indirect pressures on the U.S. Government to stop "unwarranted and brutal suppression of American [sic] Negroes by police";

Mau Mau Society, whose leader, Charles Morris, was quoted as saying Negro youth "must take machetes and destroy Uncle Toms" (Negroes friendly to whites).

Exhibits were entered on these and other groups which had been involved in racial agitation in the New York City area following the 1964 Harlem riot. Mr. Romerstein emphasized that such racial agitation is currently taking place just as it has over the past 4 years and even before then.

At the close of the hearings, Chairman Willis stated in reference to the agitational activities of the Progressive Labor Party in the Harlem area:

I do not believe there can be doubt in the mind of any reasonable person but that these activities tended to—and were designed to—inflame the community and arouse emotions to such an intense pitch that any number of incidents might have touched off a riot.

The Progressive Labor Party, of course, was not the only subversive organization operating in the area. Other such groups took actions and distributed propaganda which inflamed the community. The most important role, however, was clearly played by the Progressive Labor Party.

In my view, there is no doubt but that subversive elements played a major and probably the key role in precipitating the Harlem riot of July 1964.

### Part 3—Los Angeles (Watts Riot)

On November 28, the subcommittee continued its hearings on subversive influences in riots, looting, and burning, with particular reference to "the Watts riot of 1965 in Los Angeles and activity conducted by certain groups prior to, during, and after the riot."

Committee counsel noted that the riot in the Watts area broke out on August 11, 1965, and lasted for 7 days. Its toll was 37 deaths, an unknown number of injured, over 4,000 arrests, 600 buildings destroyed, and an estimated property damage of \$40 million.

### TESTIMONY OF JAMES C. HARRIS

The first witness was Detective James C. Harris of the Los Angeles district attorney's office. Mr. Harris testified that an organization called Communist Party U.S.A. (Marxist-Leninist), a group whose headquarters are located in Los Angeles, had "concentrated on agitation in the Negro community."

Detective Harris noted that the leader and founder of the group, Michael Isaac Laski, a former student at UCLA, had organized a "Marxism Discussion Group" there in 1960. Later, in 1964, Laski served as West Coast organizer of the Provisional Organizing Committee to Reconstitute the Marxist-Leninist Communist Party U.S.A. (POC), a Communist Party splinter group.

The POC, the Los Angeles detective declared, organized a front group for the purpose of racial agitation: Freedom for the People, an organization which rejected integration as a solution to the Negro's plight in America. Michael Laski also instituted a labor-type group, the Automobile Maintenance Workers' Union, which organized employees of Los Angeles carwash businesses. Another POC front was the Watts Action Committee, an organization whose "purpose was to promote animosity towards the police and other law enforcement personnel."

Prior to and through the 1965 Watts riot, Laski agitated in the predominantly Negro Watts section of Los Angeles in the name of the POC.

In September 1965, following the Watts riot and after having been expelled from the POC, Laski and a handful of his followers from that organization formed the aforementioned Communist Party, United States of America (Marxist-Leninist). The main program of this new group, according to the witness, continued to be "primarily agitation in Watts."

He continued:

They have utilized charges of police brutality, the Vietnam issue. They have advocated a Chinese political philosophy and the formation of what they call the People's Armed Defense Groups in order to oppose alleged police brutality.

Detective Harris told the subcommittee that Laski's group intermittently published a journal entitled *People's Voice* and also *Red Flag*, which contained highly inflammatory articles designed to sustain an atmosphere of racial tension in the Watts area. Samples of these publications were offered for insertion in the hearing record.

The witness said that the CPUSA-ML also maintained a propaganda outlet, the Worker's International Book Store, in Los Angeles. The bookstore offered literature which advocated a Red Chinese political philosophy and, according to its own letters, all kinds of "revolutionary magazines, books, and periodicals."

The witness then cited a number of examples of agitation on the theme of "police brutality" by the CPUSA-ML. He underscored these examples with appropriate exhibits.

Detective Harris expressed the belief that the "intent of the CPUSA-ML has been to aggravate" the Negro population in Los Angeles "to the point of civil disobedience and to attempt to condition their minds to respond in a rebellious way in the event of a contact with a police officer."

In the resumption of his testimony the following day, Detective Harris offered a number of highly inflammatory documents which were produced and disseminated by the CPUSA-ML in the Los Angeles area.

#### TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM A. WHEELER

Mr. Wheeler, a committee investigator for 20 years, assigned to the West Coast since 1951, testified that the Los Angeles Committee to Support Grievances of Watts Negroes was an outgrowth of the Committee To End the War in Vietnam (CEWV). The CEWV, in turn, was "a united front effort" of "the Socialist Party, Socialist Workers Party, Students for a Democratic Society, the Los Angeles W. E. B. DuBois Club, and the Young Socialist Alliance," youth arm of the Trotskyist Communist organization, the Socialist Workers Party.

The committee's West Coast investigator submitted for exhibit documents prepared by the Committee to Support Grievances of Watts Negroes, one of which was headed:

STOP POLICE REPRESSION OF WATTS NEGROES!! FIRE POLICE  
CHIEF PARKER!! CREATE A CIVILIAN POLICE REVIEW BOARD!!  
ELIMINATE GHETTO CONDITIONS!!

Mr. Wheeler stated that an organization known as the Congress of Unrepresented People replaced the Committee to Support Grievances of Watts Negroes in August 1965. He then testified as to the identity of the participants in an August 21, 1965, demonstration sponsored by the Congress of Unrepresented People as members of the Socialist Party, Socialist Workers Party, W. E. B. DuBois Club, Communist Party, and Young Socialist Alliance.

#### TESTIMONY OF JAMES C. HARRIS—Resumed

Detective Harris, recalled to the stand, stated that an organization known as the South Side Citizens Defense Committee was identified by the Los Angeles district attorney's office "as a front of the old-line Communist Party and formed for the purpose of capitalizing on the Watts riot." The address of the South Side Citizens Defense Committee was shown to be identical to that of the Committee To Defend the Bill of Rights, the successor organization to the old Communist front organization, the Los Angeles Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.

He testified that another agitational group operating in Watts after the riot was the Watts Council for Equal Rights, a creation of the Provisional Organizing Committee to Reconstitute the Marxist-Leninist Communist Party. The Watts Council for Equal Rights was formed in November 1965.

Detective Harris stated that the group was involved in agitation at the time of the "Deadwyler affair in Los Angeles." Leonard Deadwyler was a Negro accidentally shot by a police officer in May 1966. (As revealed in later testimony, a number of Communist organizations seized upon the Deadwyler affair in mounting a vociferous racial-agitation campaign against alleged "police brutality.")

Chairman Willis told the witness that he had made a great contribution to the committee. He added:

Mayor Yorty, a former Member of Congress, testified that the minds of the people, particularly the colored people in the Watts area, were conditioned for a long time to set the scene and to prepare them for the riots. Then yesterday we covered, through you, the conditions prevailing during the riots.

This morning, you and Mr. Wheeler, an employee of this committee, talked about the postriot shenanigans going on.

Now, in short, as I understand it, these nefarious activities started a long time ago. They were pursued during the riot and, after the riot, unquestionably under one form or guise or another are still going on in the Los Angeles area.

#### TESTIMONY OF CLAYTON R. ANDERSON

On November 30, 1967, the subcommittee convened to hear the testimony of Lieutenant Clayton R. Anderson concerning postriot activities in the Los Angeles area.

Lieutenant Anderson stated that he was employed in the intelligence section of the Los Angeles district attorney's bureau of investigation.



He testified that the Freedom Now Committee in Los Angeles held a press conference on February 10, 1966, at which it was stated that the purpose of the committee was to stage a demonstration on February 12, 1966, for "complete freedom for American Negro citizens now and immediate withdrawal of all U.S. troops from Vietnam."

The police intelligence officer stated that key leaders of the Freedom Now Committee were leaders of the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs.

Lieutenant Anderson said that the demonstration was held as scheduled and was comprised of "less than 100 actual demonstrators," of whom about "25 percent" were either DuBois clubs members, Communist Party members, or former party members.

The witness revealed that the Freedom Now Committee was apparently formed especially for the February 12, 1966, demonstration because it was abandoned after the march.

Lieutenant Anderson told the subcommittee that an organization called the Ad Hoc Committee To End Police Malpractices sponsored a demonstration at Los Angeles City Hall on September 24, 1964. The Ad Hoc Committee, "a front group of the W. E. B. DuBois Club of Los Angeles," demanded immediate action to correct alleged police malpractice, and asked for the resignation of the chief of police and the establishment of a civilian police review board. This demonstration took place 11 months prior to the Watts riot.

Another organization which was established after the riot in the Watts area was the Community Alert Patrol. Mr. Anderson noted that this group, while not subversive, was a nuisance. The members of the Community Alert Patrol had had their cars equipped with short-wave radios and would respond to police calls in order to observe any incidents of so-called police brutality. The group, however, never made any charges of police brutality against the Los Angeles Police Department.

Lieutenant Anderson also mentioned the "Deadwyler case" and stated that although the policeman was cleared by a coroner's jury, "a number of Communist and extreme leftwing organizations tried to capitalize on this accidental killing to foment racial discord in the Watts area."

The Committee To End Legalized Murder by Cops was "formed for agitation during the Deadwyler inquest." Key leaders of this committee included high-ranking officials of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs.

The "End Legalized Murder" committee held an unruly demonstration by some 350 demonstrators on May 17, 1966, in front of the 77th Division police station. Among these demonstrators were a number of well-known members of the Communist Party, the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs, and other Communist organizations.

Lieutenant Anderson described the demonstrations which took place during the Deadwyler inquest and then introduced literature and a number of inflammatory handbills which had been distributed for agitational purposes during this demonstration by the CPUSA-ML, the Muslims of the Nation of Islam, and the Progressive Labor Party.

Lieutenant Anderson pointed out that John Wesley Harris, Watts area organizer for the Progressive Labor Party, was arrested for distributing insurrectional literature at the Deadwyler hearing.

Shortly thereafter the Committee to Defend John Harris was organized—chiefly by members of the Progressive Labor Party, but it also was endorsed and supported by the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs.

#### TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM A. WHEELER—Resumed

Committee investigator Wheeler returned to the witness stand and testified about an organization called the Afro-American Cultural Association, apparently formed in December 1966, and headed by black nationalist playwright Frank Greenwood, who had formerly been associated with various Communist Party front groups.

Mr. Wheeler stated that Greenwood has been connected with the Black Anti-Draft Union in Los Angeles.

Investigator Wheeler attested to information concerning a group called Self Leadership for All Nationalities Today (SLANT), which was formed on August 19, 1965, 2 days subsequent to the Watts riot.

The motto of SLANT is "BROTHERHOOD-UNITY-RESPONSIBILITY-NATIONWIDE." The initials of this motto spell "BURN."

The founder of SLANT, Tommy Ray Jacquette, a former social worker with the Westminster Neighborhood Association, a federally funded charity organization, has stated, "change for the Negroes can never be brought about without violence."

The committee investigator stated that he had also investigated the activities of an organization called simply "US." The key leaders of US are Ron Karenga, chairman, and Allen Jamal, vice chairman. Both men are known to be militant black nationalist extremists.

The revolutionary philosophy of US, as developed by Ron Karenga, was thoroughly documented as Mr. Wheeler read a number of statements by its militant chairman into the record.

US was documented to be anti-Semitic in its pronouncements and extremely militant in its activities. "On October 19, 1967, five members of the US organization were arrested for throwing Molotov cocktails in a bakery in the Watts area," the witness said.

Mr. Wheeler said, in reference to CPUSA participation in the Watts riot: "The Communist Party has been very cautious. It has done little or nothing under its own name." He added, however, that both the Communist Party and the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs, its youth arm, had set up various fronts to "foster racial division and antagonism in the Los Angeles area" while attempting to conceal the role of the party in such activity.

The fronts set up by the Communist Party, he stated, included the South Side Citizens Defense Committee, the Committee To End Legalized Murder by Cops, and the Freedom Now Committee.

The W. E. B. DuBois Clubs and/or their leaders and members supported and took part in the activities of the following racial-agitation organizations in the Los Angeles area:

- Committee to Support Grievances of Watts Negroes
- Ad Hoc Committee To End Police Malpractices
- Congress of Unrepresented People
- South Side Citizens Defense Committee
- Freedom Now Committee
- Committee for the Defense of John Harris

Mr. Wheeler stated: "Finally, as previously indicated, on the national level the DuBois Clubs have called for the separation of the Watts area from the city of Los Angeles."

The "Socialist Workers Party issued a statement which, like that of the Communist Party, exonerated the rioters \* \* \*." This statement was published 2 days after the Watts riot had ended.

Investigator Wheeler commented briefly concerning the activity of the Progressive Labor Party in circulating inflammatory literature during the Watts riot. PLP distributed posters and flyers titled: "Don't be a sucker!" (This pamphlet asked the question: "ISN'T THIS A DECLARATION OF WAR AGAINST THE AFRO-AMERICAN PEOPLE BY THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT?"); "BLACK LIBERATION—NOW!"; "THE NEED FOR REVOLUTION"; "WANTED FOR MURDER—Parker the Cop in Watts" (This poster was patterned after the PLP's "Wanted for Murder—Gilligan the Cop" poster which was distributed during the Harlem riot of 1964.); and, during the Deadwyler affair, "WANTED for the MURDER of Leonard Deadwyler—BOVA—the COP."

PLP leader, John Wesley Harris, was indicted for criminal syndicalism for his agitational activities during the Deadwyler inquest. The PLP then formed the Committee to Defend John Harris, which "has been used not only to assist in Harris' defense, but also to further racial discord, and for the distribution of inflammatory literature." Mr. Wheeler noted that Harris "has since proclaimed that he is proud to be a Communist."

In his concluding remarks, Mr. Tuck stated:

This hearing has not proved that the Watts riot of August 1965 was instigated by the Communists. The record indicates that most of this literature was distributed after the riot in an apparent attempt to capitalize on it and incite further violence. Some of it, however, was distributed prior to the riot. To have engaged in this activity in disturbing the community after the Watts riot is even worse than it was before the riot.

\* \* \* \* \*

Whether or not Communists and black nationalist elements can be said to have played a major role in the initial Watts riot, it is clear that their desire and intent is to foment racial violence in this country and that they are doing everything possible to accomplish that end.

#### INVESTIGATIVE HEARINGS ON COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE CENTRAL CALIFORNIA AREA

Subcommittees of the Committee on Un-American Activities held hearings in executive session in San Francisco, Calif., on July 12, 1964, and in Washington, D.C., on April 27 and 28, 1966.

The subcommittee members for the 1964 hearing were: Representatives Joe R. Pool, of Texas, chairman; George F. Senner, Jr., of Arizona; August E. Johansen, of Michigan; Henry C. Schadeberg, of Wisconsin; and John M. Ashbrook, of Ohio. The subcommittee members for the 1966 hearing were: Representatives William M. Tuck, of Virginia, chairman; Joe R. Pool, of Texas; and John M. Ashbrook, of Ohio.

The subject of inquiry, fully set forth in committee resolutions, concerned the structure, objectives, and tactics of the Communist Party of the United States in the party's California districts. The legislative purpose of the hearings, pursuant to the mandate of the House to the committee, was to provide factual information to aid

the House in the disposition of pending legislation and generally to aid the Congress in the proposal of any necessary remedial legislation.

The testimony of two witnesses, that of Howard Thompson received in San Francisco, and of his wife, Lulu Mae Thompson, received in Washington, D.C., was released by the committee on December 7, 1967.

Mr. and Mrs. Howard O. Thompson had maintained membership in the Communist Party for the purpose of assisting the Federal Bureau of Investigation in its investigation of subversive activities. They were not at any time in sympathy with the Communist Party. While expressing the thanks of the committee for their testimony, Mr. Tuck, chairman of the subcommittee, said to Mrs. Thompson:

Lenin described the Communist Party as an organization of professional revolutionaries which "must of necessity be not too extensive and as secret as possible." Our investigations point to the fact that the Communist Party has not departed from the basic principle of secrecy in the conduct of its activities in the United States. As a result, reliable information relating to party activities must be obtained principally by means of the investigative process.

Further, in light of the secrecy of Communist Party activities, the Government must rely in great part on undercover sources to obtain this information.

Without the assistance of dedicated and patriotic Americans such as you and your husband, Mrs. Thompson, the Government would be greatly handicapped in its efforts to protect our national security against the encroachments of hostile foreign powers. Without such assistance, both the executive branch, which is charged with the execution of the laws of the United States, and the Congress itself, from which these laws must emanate, would in many instances find themselves totally obstructed.

HOWARD O. THOMPSON

The witness Howard Thompson served as an informant of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the period from March 1948 until March 1962.

He was born in Michigan in 1909 and completed the eighth grade at Grand Rapids. After a period of service in the Navy, he was honorably discharged in 1946 as a lieutenant junior grade. At the time of his initial contact with the Communist Party he lived in Stockton, Calif., and was employed by the International Harvester Co. He became interested in serving the FBI as a result of contacts with FBI agents whom he met at Naval Reserve meetings.

He joined a Communist Party cell at Stockton in March 1948 and remained in the party until March 1962—a period of 14 years—except for a period from early 1951 until October 1952. The party decided that he should be "expelled" in 1951 for "security" reasons because he had obtained employment at that time with the Federal Government at the Sharpe General Depot (Army) and had to execute a loyalty oath for employment purposes. He was reinstated in October 1952, after leaving Government employment.

In December 1950 he married Lulu Mae Thompson. She also served as an FBI informant and became a formal member of the Communist Party for the period 1953 until 1962. Both Howard Thompson and his wife, Lulu Mae, terminated their membership in March 1962, at which time Mrs. Thompson was publicly identified as an FBI informant when testifying as a witness in a Government prosecution against Archie Brown, a top West Coast Communist Party leader.

Howard Thompson testified that his invitation to join the Communist Party followed a period of activity with the Independent

Progressive Party, identified in the reports of the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist Party front. While active with the Independent Progressive Party, he was called upon to distribute Communist Party literature on behalf of Henry Wallace, candidate of the Progressive Party for the presidency of the United States. In the course of the campaign and at public meetings, he came in contact with party members and party sympathizers and achieved notice as a likely recruit for Communist Party membership. He was invited to a number of meetings at the homes of Communist Party members. He was asked to join the Communist Party in March 1948 and was assigned to the San Joaquin County Club of the party, which then had a membership of approximately 12, and from which he received his party membership card. He remained a member of the San Joaquin County Club until March 1962, except for the 1951-52 period of expulsion previously mentioned.

This club or cell of the party met in secrecy. Only party members were permitted to attend its business meetings. During the period of his membership he held various positions including those of club chairman and secretary; delegate in January 1957 to the first session of the State convention of the Communist Party in Los Angeles, Calif.; delegate in February 1957 to the second session of the State party convention held in San Francisco; delegate in 1957 to the founding convention of the Communist Party, Northern District of California; delegate in November 1959 to the first session of the convention of the Communist Party, Northern District of California; and delegate in 1960 to the second session of the Communist Party convention, Northern District of California.

Following his marriage in December 1950 to Lulu Mae Thompson, he testified that she also agreed to assist the FBI and was subsequently, in June 1953, invited to join the Communist Party. She was likewise assigned to the San Joaquin County Club.

Shortly thereafter two members of the club, Howard Keylor and his wife, Evangeline Keylor, charged that the witness and his wife were Government informants. A trial was held in 1954, conducted by the State disciplinary committee of the Communist Party, consisting of Lee Kutnick, Virgil Cole, and Rude Lambert. The charges were considered over a period of 7 to 8 months, with the result that the witness and his wife were absolved and reinstated.

As chairman of the San Joaquin County Club for about 2 years, he chaired meetings and led discussions. The agenda was determined by the leadership of the party. Discussions were based on Communist Party publications such as *Political Affairs* and *People's World*. Subjects also considered included the recruitment of new members and the infiltration of other organizations, such as labor unions, churches, and the NAACP.

He testified that he had become acquainted with Communist Party members other than those who were members of his club or cell by reason of the fact that his wife had been elected to the executive committee of the San Joaquin Valley Section, which met at his house, and was section delegate to the district committee of the Communist Party. The section was established as a means of coordinating the work of clubs in the Valley with the district leadership.

He said that no plans were made by his cell to do anything involving the use of force or violence. He indicated that, due to the 1948 Smith

Act prosecutions, the party leadership had worked to produce an appearance of "peaceful coexistence." Members of the party, he said, did not openly come out in the sense of saying that "we want force or violence." They indicated that such force and violence would be brought on by the other people, meaning the "capitalists."

He said that there were within the Communist Party "extreme right" and "extreme left" factions. He related that on one occasion when Gus Hall, general secretary of the Communist Party, came to San Francisco he was "shocked" to find that one club had talked of force and violence. A number of "leftists," Thompson testified, had gone over to the "Trotskyite" organization [the Socialist Workers Party], and a great number of the Stalinites had moved over to the Red China faction. He pointed out, however, that the Communist Party maintained contact with former members who, although expelled as "extreme left," could be brought back into the party if needed.

He testified that prior to 1957 the State of California constituted one district of the Communist Party, governed by a State committee. Following the 16th National Convention of the Communist Party held in New York in February 1957, a district convention was held at Los Angeles in early 1957, at which the State of California was split into two districts, the Northern and Southern.

Mr. Thompson testified that he was a delegate to the first session of the State convention of the Communist Party held in January 1957, at which the proposed division of the State of California into two separate districts was discussed. Other issues were considered, including the "Negro question" and foreign policy resolutions in support of the Soviet Union, particularly support for the nuclear test ban and for trade with Red China.

He also attended the second session of the State convention in 1957, following the 16th National Convention in New York, at which the division of the State was approved.

The founding convention of the Communist Party, Northern District of California, was held in April 1957 at San Francisco, which the witness attended as a delegate. The Northern District encompassed an area to the Oregon border on the north, Nevada to the east, Tulare County inclusive to the south, and Santa Cruz County inclusive to the coast. The district was further divided into sections. The sections were generally constituted on a county basis for the administration of a number of clubs in each section, and included the San Francisco County area; the East Bay Region; Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, and San Mateo Counties; Sonoma County; Marin County; Humboldt County; and the Valley Section. At this founding convention the sections caucused separately and nominated representatives for the district committee, which was composed of about 26 members.

It was the function of the district committee to form policies and to issue directives for the delegates to take back to their sections. It met about once a month at the offices of the party's publication, *People's World*, at 81 Clementina Street, San Francisco, Calif. Although Mr. Thompson was not a member of the district committee, his wife, for whom he served as chauffeur, was, and therefore he was permitted to attend district meetings as an "observer." Mickey Lima served as chairman, and Archie Brown as vice chairman, of the Northern California District Committee.

Following the June 5, 1961, decision of the Supreme Court, which upheld the order of the Subversive Activities Control Board requiring the Communist Party to register as a Communist-action organization, Mr. Thompson testified that for security reasons the district committee was dissolved and replaced by an executive board of only seven individuals. Members of the executive board served as liaison with the "outlying counties committee," which was composed of other members of the district committee. The reorganization cut down the number of members assembled at any one meeting, making it more difficult for the FBI to gather evidence.

Within the district organization a number of "commissions" had been established, such as the Trade Union Commission, Agricultural Workers Commission, Youth Commission, Negro Commission, Legislative Commission, and Peace Commission, which were responsible for planning party work in certain areas of activity which their titles described. These commissions functioned under the jurisdiction of the district committee. The witness himself had served for a while on the Trade Union Commission and the Agricultural Workers Commission.

The Trade Union Commission prepared programs for party activity within labor unions and their political action machinery. Party literature was designed to gradually influence the attitude of the workers of the United States away from "the capitalistic system to the socialistic system, and then to communism, which is the ultimate of socialism."

The objectives of the Agricultural Workers Commission, he said, were mainly to influence the AFL-CIO Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee in policy matters, particularly with regard to the union's effort to organize Mexican contract workers laboring on domestic farms and, within this framework, to endeavor to recruit new Communist Party members. Literature distributed by the Agricultural Workers Commission was intended to bring to the workers the message that the solution to their problems was that offered by communism.

He said the objective of the Negro Commission was to infiltrate the Negro movement and to influence Negroes. The propaganda line adopted for that purpose was to support total integration, although prior to the 17th National Convention of the Communist Party in 1959 the line of the party had been to establish a separate Negro nation within the United States.

The purpose of the Youth Commission was to organize youth groups with a view toward recruiting them as party members. The Legislative Commission was principally organized to secure the repeal of security legislation.

The objective of the Peace Commission was to promote the "peace movement" which had a twofold objective: to lull the people into a sense of false security and to infiltrate legitimate and sincere organizations, including church, religious, and educational institutions, so that their members could be influenced and later involved in the work of the Communist Party.

With regard to the activity of Communist Party members in religious organizations, the witness testified that, while the Communist Party holds that there is no God and that all things are material, the party's violent hostility to the church had diminished because it decided that it could use the church in the "peace movement" today

more than ever before. Therefore, it expressed a degree of tolerance toward religious ideas in its effort to infiltrate and influence churches.

The witness testified that his wife attended, as a delegate, the 17th National Convention of the Communist Party held in New York in December 1959. Immediately prior to the national convention a first session of the Northern California District convention was held in November 1959. In February 1960, immediately following the national convention, a second session of the district convention was convened, which the witness also attended as a delegate. These were the last conventions that took place prior to the witness' termination of membership in the Communist Party.

In closing, the witness said:

The thing that bothers me sometimes is the fact that so many people seem to think that the Communists prey on the Negro. One of the hardest things that they ever had in this State was trying to infiltrate the NAACP. It doesn't work out. Also, the labor unions. By and large, they don't have any use for them, because most of them, especially in the past, would stand before a group of men and talk about the day when they would live in a capitalist's house and the capitalist would be out digging the ditch. Well, the average laboring man is not concerned with that. He is concerned with conditions today. The party has recognized that mistake and today is working more not to make this great change from the laborer over to the Communist in one fell swoop, but rather to try and infiltrate in and contact him and bring him gradually under their wing. They feel that the education of the proletariat must be taken over a period of years and not overnight.

#### LULU MAE THOMPSON

Mrs. Lulu Mae Thompson testified that she was born in Lodi, Calif., in 1915. She is a high school graduate. Following her marriage to the witness Howard Thompson on December 30, 1950, she joined the Communist Party in Stockton, Calif., at the request of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and reported on the party's activities.

She maintained membership in the Communist Party from June of 1953 until March 30, 1962, at which time she became a public witness for the Government in a prosecution of Archie Brown, an official of the Communist Party in California, who was charged with a violation of section 504 of the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959.

Upon becoming a member of the Communist Party, Mrs. Thompson was assigned to the same cell to which her husband belonged, the San Joaquin County Club of the Communist Party. She served as secretary-treasurer of the San Joaquin County Club from 1956 until 1962. For the period 1957 to 1962 she served as chairman of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley Section and as a member of its executive board, and in the same period also served as a section representative on the Northern California District Committee of the Communist Party. She was a delegate to both sessions of the Northern California District convention of the Communist Party, held respectively in November 1959 and February 1960, and a delegate to the 17th National Convention of the Communist Party held in December 1959.

When she joined the Communist Party in 1953, the State of California constituted one administrative unit of the Communist Party of the United States designated as the California District. William Schneiderman served as chairman of the California District. Following the 16th National Convention of the Communist Party,



held in 1957, the California District was reconstituted as two districts known as the Northern and Southern California Districts of the Communist Party. The dividing line was at Monterey and Tulare Counties—everything south thereof constituted the Southern District, and the area to the north constituted the Northern District.

Albert Lima, also known as Mickey Lima, served as chairman of the Northern District and Dorothy Healey as chairman of the Southern District, continuously since the creation of the districts and until Mrs. Thompson left the party in March of 1962. Mrs. Thompson, whose membership was in the Northern District, testified that the offices of the Northern District were maintained on Market Street in San Francisco, but that party business was conducted from Mickey Lima's home on Dover Street, Oakland, Calif.

She testified that the State of California was divided into two districts because of the differing characteristics of the areas. Northern California was principally agricultural and rural, while southern California was principally manufacturing. The Northern District was further subdivided for administrative purposes into sections. A section was constituted of two or more clubs. A club was the basic organizational unit of the Communist Party. Clubs and sections were formed on a county, neighborhood, industrial, and professional basis. Officers were appointed or elected for each level of organization. The chain of command descended from the national organization, to the district, to the sections, and to the clubs.

Mrs. Thompson testified that, while she was aware of the existence of clubs or sections formed exclusively of members whose professions were in law, medicine, teaching, and so forth, the identity of the professional clubs and sections of the Communist Party and their membership were not known to her. She testified that this information was kept secret and was not given to her even though she was a district committee member. The professional members of the Communist Party were people who were advanced in party policy and in the principles of Marxism and Leninism.

Mrs. Thompson related the circumstances surrounding her induction in June of 1953 as a member of the San Joaquin County Club of the Communist Party. As previously stated, her husband was a member of the Communist Party, in the service of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, at the time of her marriage in 1950. Party meetings were held from time to time in his home. She did not attend these meetings because only party members were permitted to attend. On the occasion of a party meeting at their home in June of 1953, she remained outside in a trailer house belonging to Leila Noland, a retired English teacher from the University of California, who occupied a portion of their property. After the meeting, the witness returned to her home and served refreshments to the persons who had attended the meeting. The next day, Leila Noland approached her and told Mrs. Thompson that she had been proposed for membership in the party. In reply Mrs. Thompson said that she did not believe she had sufficient knowledge of Marxism and Leninism to be accepted as a party member. Mrs. Noland said that that could be taken care of and that she would personally give her instructions on the subject. Her admission to party membership was not through any formal ceremony and she received no party card. As a security measure, the

party was not issuing cards following the Smith Act prosecutions in the late 1940's.

After her induction in 1953, accusations were made by Howard Keylor, a longshoreman, and his wife Evangeline, members of the Stockton cell, against Mrs. Thompson and her husband. They charged that Mrs. Thompson and her husband were "stool pigeons" for the FBI. An additional charge was made against the witness of "white chauvinism," which in Communist semantics meant that she was guilty of maintaining an attitude of white supremacy. Mrs. Thompson explained that Mrs. Keylor was a Filipino and felt that Mrs. Thompson was not treating her with "due deference." It also appeared that Mr. Keylor was jealous of Mrs. Thompson's husband, who had advanced rapidly in party leadership. A trial committee was set up by the State office of the Communist Party, composed of Virgil Cole, a carpenter from Chico; Lee Kutnick, a secretary from the San Francisco area; and Rude Lambert, a party functionary who lived in San Francisco. The charges were not disposed of for several months. While the charges were being considered, the witness did not attend meetings of the club. Mr. and Mrs. Thompson were acquitted after a lengthy trial and resumed meeting at the club level about 1955.

Mrs. Thompson served as secretary-treasurer of the club. As such, her function was to collect dues and turn them over to the section's financial secretary. Dues were payable monthly and the amount paid depended upon the member's employment classification. For example, students paid 15 cents a month; housewives and unemployed paid 50 cents a month. A percentage of the dues was retained by the club and the balance turned over to the section secretary-treasurer, who in turn retained a percentage for the section and reported the balance to the district office. The district office in turn retained a percentage and forwarded the balance to the national headquarters of the Communist Party.

As club secretary-treasurer collecting the dues, Mrs. Thompson knew, of course, who was paying the dues. However, in reporting the dues to the next highest administrative unit—the section—only the number of the member who paid, not his name, was reported. This was another means of maintaining membership security. Mrs. Thompson was able to learn of the existence of other clubs and sections and of certain facts relating to their leadership only by reason of her membership on the executive board of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley Section and district committee and as a delegate to district and national conventions.

There were about eight clubs attached to the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley Section. The section organization was a means of passing directives to the local clubs which the section leaders in turn had received from the district committee. The section committee was composed of two delegates from each club within the section, and the section committee in turn elected an executive board, which prepared the agenda for section meetings. The section executive board in turn received its instructions from the district committee, a member or members of which would generally attend the section meetings.

The witness learned of the existence of other sections by reason of her attendance at meetings of the district committee, composed of representatives from each section. Mrs. Thompson served on the

district committee from May 1957 to March 1962, at which time she left the party. She was elected to the office of district committee member by a vote of the members of the party in her Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley Section. She said that while the process appears to be democratic, so that rank-and-file members think they have a hand in the process, the election is in fact controlled by the party's top leadership. While names are proposed on club and section levels, the nominations are screened and those on the preferred list of candidates are the ones who are elected. Nominations from the floor are not favored, and no one who has not been on a preferred list of candidates has ever been elected.

The district committee met monthly. It considered policy handed down from the National Committee of the Communist Party and passed it to the sections, which in turn passed it to the clubs. The district committee also controlled the policies of the party's West Coast newspaper, the *People's World*. An executive committee was appointed by the district committee from among its members to conduct the business of the district when the district committee was not in session.

Certain commissions or planning units were established by the district leadership to serve under its supervision and direction to assist in the conduct of the business and activities of the district. They consisted of a Trade Union Commission, Agricultural Workers Commission, Youth Commission, Negro Commission, Legislative Commission, and a Peace Commission. Membership on the commissions was appointive. Mrs. Thompson, a district committee member, served as a member of the Agricultural Workers Commission. The directives prepared by the commissions were first submitted to the district committee for approval. Meetings of the commissions would take place usually at the homes of members of the commission.

Mrs. Thompson briefly explored the objectives of the commissions. The Trade Union Commission considered legislation affecting the trade union movement and formulated party positions on various trade union problems, on the basis of guidelines conforming to national party directives. The purpose of the commission was to formulate the party line with a view toward involving and influencing the trade union movement along that line.

The Agricultural Workers Commission was formed at the time the AFL-CIO embarked on a program to organize farmworkers. The commission was formed with the express purpose of involving itself in the organization of farmworkers in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley. The commission hoped to attract agricultural workers to the Communist Party by assisting the trade union movement. It was also an objective of the commission to influence the Teamsters to join in the effort of the AFL-CIO to unionize agricultural workers.

The Negro Commission sought mainly to carry out the directives of the 17th National Convention of the Communist Party designed to draw Negroes into the party. The party also sought to infiltrate Negro organizations and to influence them along the Communist Party line.

The Peace Commission's work was to promote peace demonstrations and to influence other organizations to participate in them. The emphasis was placed on finding organizations to front for the party's "peace" activities. For this purpose, members of the Stockton club affiliated with religious organizations. The Keylors affiliated with the Unitarian Church. Mrs. Keylor became a Sunday school teacher.

Howard and Evangeline Keylor also endeavored to infiltrate a Quaker group by participating in its activities. For example, a group of Indonesian students were touring the country under the auspices of the American Friends Service Committee and came to Stockton. The local Quaker group called upon Howard Keylor to escort the Indonesian students and show them around while they were in town.

The witness advised that general policy lines were laid down at the national convention. The witness was a delegate from the Northern District of California to the 1959 national convention of the Communist Party held in New York City. In preparation for the national convention, district conventions were held prior thereto. Immediately preceding the December 1959 national convention, the first session of the Northern California District convention convened in November of that year.

Delegates to the district convention were selected from each club. At the first session of the district convention these delegates in turn elected delegates to attend the forthcoming national convention. The first session of the district convention also considered draft resolutions submitted by the national organization of the Communist Party which were to be considered at the national convention. Thus, the district delegations were kept informed of the area of thinking of the national leadership. Likewise, these proposals were previously discussed in club meetings in preparation for the district convention. The district convention then took positions upon these draft resolutions and submitted them to the resolutions committee of the national convention. Mrs. Thompson commented upon a number of such draft resolutions which had been considered on the district level.

Following the first session of the district convention, the national convention convened. Mrs. Thompson, together with a number of other delegates whom she identified, attended the December 1959, 17th National Convention of the Communist Party. On registering at the convention, she received a packet of program materials, including draft resolutions, with which the convention would be concerned. [These were introduced as exhibits in the committee record.] The program materials, the keynote address of Gus Hall (the party's general secretary), and the various reports prepared by members of the National Committee of the Communist Party fixed the guidelines for the resolutions and the actions to be taken at the national convention.

Resolutions committees were then appointed. Among them was the resolutions committee on Latin America, to which Mrs. Thompson was appointed. The members of this committee were appointed by the various delegations to the convention. The witness introduced a resolution adopted by the committee. She does not know specifically by whom the resolution was prepared. She was told that resolutions would be formulated by the chairman of the committee, but she did not know from whom the chairman obtained the mimeographed resolution which the committee considered. She did say that the committee on which she served had no part in its preparation.

Other business before the national convention also included the selection of members of the National Committee of the Communist Party, who were to conduct the party's affairs between-conventions. Each district was allowed representation on the national committee according to its membership. A portion of the national committee was likewise made up of delegates at large. For membership on the national

committee, the Northern California District nominated Mickey Lima, Roscoe Proctor, and Juanita Wheeler, who were subsequently elected to the national committee.

Mrs. Thompson explained that the resolutions and policies adopted at the national convention were communicated to and implemented on the district level of the party. Following the national convention, the Northern California District delegates returned and met in the offices of the party's publication, *People's World*, in San Francisco and prepared a report which was subsequently made to the district committee. An outline of this report was prepared and disseminated within the district in preparation for the convening of the second session of the Northern California District convention which followed in February 1960.

At the second session of the district convention, attended by Mrs. Thompson, reports were rendered by district leaders and by Gus Hall, general secretary of the national organization. Reports were presented on the subject of carrying out the national convention resolutions. Mrs. Thompson explained the nature of certain specific resolutions and the manner in which they were implemented within the district organization.

The witness was also interrogated upon a number of other subjects. Of particular interest was the reaction of the Communist Party within her district to the Supreme Court's decision of June 5, 1961, *Communist Party v. Subversive Activities Control Board*, a landmark case which upheld the registration provisions of section 7 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 as applied to Communist-action organizations. The Court specifically sustained an order of the Subversive Activities Control Board requiring the Communist Party to register as a "Communist-action organization," that is, as an organization within the United States substantially directed, dominated, or controlled by the Soviet Union, the country directing and controlling the world Communist movement. She said the party took the position that it would not register. Mickey Lima, chairman of the Northern District, advised party members that if they were cited to appear before the Subversive Activities Control Board, they were to contact him immediately and he would put them in touch with attorneys who would "handle the situation for them."

In addition, party members were instructed not to hold any large meetings. Meetings of the district committee in the offices of the *People's World* were discontinued. The district committee likewise ceased to meet as a body and its work was delegated to a district board.

Mrs. Thompson testified that the district committee as a whole had not been consulted as to who would undertake the leadership of the district following the decision. She said that the message apparently came from the national office and was so urgent that a scheduled district committee meeting was canceled. Instead, a meeting was held with district committee representatives in the San Francisco area which received the information that the national committee wanted to put the district committee on an inactive basis. They were asked to approve this policy. Subsequently a meeting was held with other representatives in the East Bay district and then with representatives of the outlying counties.

Likewise, orders were given to sections and clubs not to meet as usual in meetings of the whole group. The section committee was

disbanded, and the section leadership met with individual clubs to relay information. Large clubs were asked to break themselves down into smaller groups.

Mrs. Thompson was asked whether these changes damaged the party. She replied:

Yes, it made their work very difficult. It was almost as bad a situation as they were under during the Smith Act prosecutions. While they did not actually go underground, they broke their organization to such a state that it was difficult to pass word out from one group to the other.

In concluding her testimony, Mrs. Thompson declared that deceit was the party's strongest weapon. She said:

Their effort is made mainly to draw in people who have not the education and ability to understand that they are lying when they put forth that they are interested in these various causes, such as saying that they are the only group in the United States defending the Bill of Rights. \* \* \*

When asked what reaction she had as a loyal and patriotic American to her contacts with the Communist Party, Mrs. Thompson replied:

Many times I would attend meetings in San Francisco which would last all day and every speaker at these meetings would try to outdo the next speaker in tearing our country down and ripping the Government to shreds. They accused our leaders of every heinous crime imaginable, including germ warfare in Korea and North Vietnam. They would deny God. They ridiculed churches and religions. I felt unclean both mentally and spiritually. It seemed when I got out in the brisk air of San Francisco I wanted to clear my lungs and breathe deeply of the San Francisco air.

I would raise my head for a breath of air and I would see our flag fluttering atop one of the tall buildings, and this would reassure me, and I knew this Government would overcome the people that were trying to tear it apart.

## CHAPTER II

### REPORTS COMPILED TO ASSIST CONGRESS IN ITS LEGISLATIVE DELIBERATIONS

#### PRELIMINARY INQUIRY INTO THE AMERICAN NAZI PARTY

Early in 1965 Representative Edwin E. Willis, the committee chairman, directed the staff to make a preliminary inquiry into the American Nazi Party and its activities for the purpose of determining whether a full-scale investigation of this group should be undertaken by the committee.

On March 30 of that year, the day the committee unanimously approved a full-scale investigation of Ku Klux Klan organizations, it also directed the continuance of the preliminary inquiry into the activities of the American Nazi Party, which the chairman had initiated.

On February 8, 1967, Representative Willis submitted to the committee his report on the completed preliminary inquiry into the American Nazi Party. The committee, on that day, voted to adopt the chairman's report as its official position on the organization.

The text of the chairman's report follows:

#### THE AMERICAN NAZI PARTY

The American Nazi Party, as its name indicates, has openly advocated a form of government for the United States that is both alien and hostile to that provided by the Constitution. It has categorized itself as a subversive organization not only by its name, but by open profession of Nazi aims. Therefore, there is no question in my mind but that the organization definitely comes within the scope of the committee's mandate. It "attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution."

The mandate of this committee is worded exactly the same as the mandate of its immediate predecessor, the Special Committee on Un-American Activities. The very first investigation conducted by that committee, and its first hearings, concerned the German-American Bund and other groups in this country which, in the late thirties, were serving as agents of the Axis powers. Its investigation led to the prosecution of a number of Nazi and Fascist leaders and, not long after its report on this investigation was published, President Roosevelt expelled from this country scores of Nazi agents mentioned in that report.

These facts, coupled with numerous remarks made on the floor of the House on May 26, 1938, when the scope of the committee's mandate was being debated, make it clear that there is no question about the committee's authority to investigate the American Nazi Party.

At present, however, we are faced with the practical question of whether or not we should exercise that authority.

Conditions are much different today than they were in the late thirties and early forties when the Special Committee investigated Nazi and Fascist organizations. The membership of the German-American Bund, the Silver Shirts, and other organizations of that type was large. Moreover, those organizations were agents of totalitarian foreign powers and enjoyed the aid and support of those powers. Because of their strength, backing, political ideology, and the threat of war the Axis posed to this Nation, they comprised a very real fifth column threat to our security. I don't think there is any question about the fact that, at that time, the Special Committee's investigation of these groups was not only justified, but needed.

Today the situation is vastly different. While George Lincoln Rockwell<sup>1</sup> has made some trips abroad and has sympathetic and ideological ties with some relatively small Nazi movements in other countries, neither he nor his party serves as an agent of any foreign Nazi government as such. In addition, nazism is largely discredited as a political ideology in all parts of the world and there are no indications that there will be any change in this situation in the near future.

The staff has been collecting information on the American Nazi Party since it was formed some 7 years ago. It has checked more thoroughly into George Lincoln Rockwell's group since I directed the preliminary inquiry to be made early in 1965. As a result of this inquiry, the staff has obtained the name of just about every person who has been a member of the party in the last few years. At the present time the Nazi Party probably has less than 50 active members. It is doubtful that it has ever at any one time had as many as 100 active members nationally.

For this reason, even though their aims and doctrines are totalitarian, reprehensible, and un-American, it is clear that Rockwell and his handful of followers are of little significance to the security of the United States in the traditional or generally accepted sense of that phrase. It is my view that we, as a committee of the Congress, would be dignifying Rockwell far beyond his importance if we were to hold hearings on his group.

Rockwell, of course, wants us to investigate his organization. He has written letters to me asking that we do so. He wants to see front-page headlines about his organization. He would like to see his picture featured on nationwide TV newscasts and spread over the pages of newspapers in all parts of the country. It would give him the publicity he not only wants, but desperately needs, at this point. I do not believe the committee should accommodate him on this matter.

The preliminary inquiry which the staff has made into the activities of the American Nazi Party indicates that while Rockwell is a demagogue and quite clever in devising publicity gimmicks, he is anything but an effective organizer, conspirator, or leader of men. We saw an example of his publicity attracting ability the year before last when one of his men rushed out on the floor of the House in blackface. It took just one of his very small number of followers to do that. Yet, the natural reaction of many people to the radio, TV, and press coverage of this action was one of alarm and a tendency to vastly overrate the strength and importance of his movement.

<sup>1</sup> On August 25, 1967, Rockwell was shot and killed in the parking lot of a shopping center near the headquarters of the American Nazi Party in Arlington, Virginia (a Washington, D.C., suburb). John Patler was convicted of Rockwell's murder on December 16, 1967, and is presently free on \$40,000 bail pending the outcome of his appeal from the conviction.



Another factor to be considered is that everywhere he goes, and whatever he does, Rockwell generates hostility and bad publicity for himself—denunciations from the pulpit, from the press, radio, and TV, and from numerous organizations and prominent individuals.

I only wish that the same were true of the Communist Party leaders who, for many reasons, pose a very real threat to this country.

In his desperate efforts to win friends and influence people, Rockwell, for a time, courted Elijah Muhammad, leader of the Black Muslims. He was the first white man to address a rally of the Muslims. He later broke with Muhammad, however, and denounced him as a hypocrite.

Despite what we must assume to be his best efforts, Rockwell has failed, after years of effort, to organize anything resembling a significant or meaningful following in the United States.

Rockwell's Nazis are anything but an impressive lot. Our investigation has revealed that quite a few of his followers have received dishonorable discharges from the armed services; a relatively large number, considering the size of the group, have criminal records and some of them have spent time in mental institutions. The so-called troopers who man the party's Arlington headquarters live poorly and have been torn by dissension based, in part, on homosexuality. The organization is not well financed. Its bank account has never reflected an impressive balance. Nazi Party literature has asked for contributions of such items as soap, razor blades, canned goods, and even old clothing.

Rockwell himself has apparently come to realize that nazism is not a salable product in this country. He recently announced that, in the hope of creating a better image, he was changing the name of his organization from "American Nazi Party" to "National Socialist White People's Party." He also indicated that the party's rallying cry would be changed from Hitler's "Sieg Heil" to "White Power." I doubt that he will gain much by this. To informed Americans, "national socialism" spells Hitlerism just as much as the term "nazism" does. I doubt, too, that Americans will be taken in by the call of "White Power," as Rockwell defines it, any more than they were taken in by Hitler's traditional rallying cry.

I wish to stress that my saying that Rockwell's party is not a threat to the security of our country is not intended to mean that it presents no danger at all. I mean only that he obviously presents no threat to the country by organized, mass action.

The unfortunate fact is that there is always a danger of another kind in groups, however small, which live on hate as though it were the bread of life. By their very nature, such organizations attract as members those who are normally described as crackpots and "kooks"—the most unstable and undesirable elements in our society. There can be no telling when an individual member, or a few members of such an organization, going completely off the deep end, will attempt an act of violence that can have terrible results.

Even more unfortunate is the fact that neither investigation nor legislation can prevent such acts of violence by the unstable, whether or not they are members of some hate group and whether the group represents the right or the left.

It is my considered opinion and that of the staff that at this time Rockwell and his handful of Nazis create no more than occasional problems which local police can adequately handle.

Certainly, if indications should develop in the future that Rockwell's party is gaining any significant number of followers and influence, I would not hesitate to recommend a full-scale investigation and public hearings on the organization's activities. Because the facts about his organization are as I have stated, however, I do not believe such an investigation or hearing should be held now. At the same time, I firmly believe that, because of the group's aims and the character of its members, the committee should continue the surveillance it has exercised over the American Nazi Party since the time it was formed.

#### COMMUNIST ORIGIN AND MANIPULATION OF VIETNAM WEEK (APRIL 8-15, 1967)

On March 31 the committee issued a 55-page report on the "Communist Origin and Manipulation of Vietnam Week (April 8-15, 1967)."

The basic purpose of this Communist-initiated propaganda activity was to reverse the U.S. Government's policy of resisting Communist aggression in Vietnam. Chairman Edwin E. Willis had stated in a press release several months prior to the issuance of the Vietnam Week report that an assortment of Communists of both the Peking and Moscow varieties, fellow travelers, Marxists, radicals, pacifists, and professional "peace" agitators had launched this "crash program" to sabotage U.S. efforts to support South Vietnamese resistance to a Communist takeover of their country.

So that there would be no misunderstanding concerning the committee's motives in releasing the Vietnam Week report, Chairman Willis pointed out in its foreword that the members not only recognized the legitimacy of honest, sincere, and responsible dissent but saw it as something to be encouraged because it was essential to the vigor, the health, and the preservation of the American system of government.

However, Mr. Willis added, the fact must be faced that there are persons who use the claim and mask of dissent for no other reason than to try to conceal the fact that their allegiance is to a power other than that of the United States. Deliberate deception, methodically employed to advance the world Communist movement, he said, is not dissent, but conspiracy. The real objective of Vietnam Week is not the expression of honest dissent, but rather it is to do injury and damage to the United States and to give aid and comfort to her enemies, the chairman stated.

Mr. Willis, in concluding his foreword, added that undoubtedly some of the young persons mentioned in the report were victimized by the Communists in their Vietnam Week activities. It was the chairman's hope that they would wake up to this fact and not become involved in similar activities in the future.

The report traced the idea for Vietnam Week back to the spring of 1966, *Dimensions*, a so-called Discussion Journal of the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America (DCA), published an article written by Bettina Aptheker, professed member of the Communist Party and the DCA.

Miss Aptheker wrote, in part :

Let us call for a nation-wide student-faculty strike in September when hundreds of thousands walk-out for several hours one fine day, and say get out of Vietnam.

Miss Aptheker, who, like her father—the leading theoretician of the Communist Party (CPUSA)—is a member of the party's national committee, had told a reporter for the Newspaper Enterprise Association that she would “spearhead a student revolution which will hopefully lead to \* \* \* the erosion of the democratic form of government” and eventual establishment of Kremlinlike leadership in the United States.”

In her *Dimensions* article, the Communist youth leader wrote that “we have been too hesitant to use militant tactics when they are appropriate.”

The DuBois Clubs held a “National Assembly of Youth for Jobs” in Washington, D.C., on August 27-28, 1966. Listed as a speaker on the program was Bettina Aptheker, who took the occasion to promote a proposal for a nationwide student strike in opposition to the war in Vietnam.

Miss Aptheker had been active, of course, prior to this meeting. Earlier in the summer she had had her proposed student strike program circulated among the members of one of the most radical student groups in this country—the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). To promote approval of her program, she attended the SDS national convention in late August, immediately following the DCA meeting, and called upon the 300 delegates to support her proposed Vietnam program.

Miss Aptheker's plan for a September 1966 nationwide student strike against the war fell through, but by September 18 of that year she had lined up 32 persons who had agreed to serve as sponsors for an organizational meeting to promote her project at some later date.

A few weeks later, the busy Communist youth leader had expanded the sponsor list to 193 persons and, with the backing of the Chicago Peace Council, had issued a call for a planning conference to be held at the University of Chicago on December 28 and 29, 1966. (The Chicago Peace Council is a group composed of Communists and pacifists as well as individuals from the radical, so-called New Left.)

#### THE CHICAGO CONFERENCE

The Chicago conference was attended by 257 persons from 49 colleges and universities, its sponsors claimed. Representatives of six Communist organizations, including the CPUSA, also attended and openly distributed literature, much of which was highly inflammatory. That the Communists were behind this proposed pro-Viet Cong student project was conceded by one of the Communist groups in attendance, the pro-Peking Progressive Labor Party (PLP). One PLP delegate wrote later that the conference was dominated by the Communist Party of the United States, its youth arm, the DCA, and the Young Socialist Alliance (YSA), a Trotskyist youth group.

The thrust of the Chicago conference's themes was specifically aimed at America's foreign commitments:

1. Bringing the GI's home;

2. Opposition to the draft;
3. Ending cooperation between the academic community and Government defense efforts.

Workshops were held on certain measures which the delegates were encouraged to promote to implement Vietnam Week on the campus, including student strikes, war crimes tribunals, antidraft activities, medical aid for "victims" of napalm bombings, and the refusal to do research which was related to the defense program.

That the Communist Party (U.S.A.) had more than a modest stake in the proceedings of the Chicago conference was evident from the lineup of party leaders who attended:

Herbert Aptheker, theoretician of the CPUSA, and his daughter Bettina; Carl Bloice, Washington correspondent of the party's official newspaper, *The Worker*, and former publications director of the DuBois Clubs; Robert Heisler, who, as the representative of the Youth Section of the CPUSA, addressed the 15th Congress of the Young Communist League of the U.S.S.R. in Moscow in 1966. Eight other sponsors of the conference have been identified as members of the Communist Party. In addition, numerous officials and members of the youth arm of the CPUSA—the DCA—attended.

Other Communist groups were also well represented at the Chicago gathering, including the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) (Trotskyist Communists) and its youth arm, the Young Socialist Alliance (YSA), and the Progressive Labor Party (PLP), the Chinese Communist-oriented organization.

#### THE ROLE OF SDS IN BETTINA APTHEKER'S NATIONAL STUDENT STRIKE

Another group which played a significant role in the Chicago meeting was the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), which claims to be the largest of the "New Left" student organizations with, allegedly, over 6,000 members in 140 chapters. It had, indeed, more representatives in Chicago for the student strike meeting than any other organization.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover had testified that SDS was one of the most militant student youth groups engaged in activities protesting U.S. foreign policy. Communists, he said, are "actively promoting and participating in" SDS's programs. In fact, over 70 Communists had demonstrated during SDS's march on Washington on April 17, 1965. Two months after this march SDS held its national convention near Kewadin, Mich. According to Mr. Hoover, "practically every subversive organization in the United States was represented" at the annual meeting. Not only does SDS not forbid such fraternization, it welcomes and encourages it. As early as 1962 when the group was organized, SDS president Carl Oglesby was quoted by an Associated Press reporter as saying, "Communists have been welcome in S.D.S. \* \* \*."

SDS recently created an organization called the Radical Educational Project (REP) which is on record for stating that "where the oppressed lack political power violent overthrow may be the necessary, though not sufficient, precondition to economic and political freedom."

Internationally SDS's new project is ambitious. It is developing a network, it claims, of guerrilla leaders, government officials and leftist youth leaders, etc., abroad, which would provide its Ann Arbor,

Mich., headquarters with firsthand reports and intelligence on insurgent movements around the world.

Jurisdictional problems arose, however, between SDS and the various united Communist groups concerning Miss Aptheker's proposed student strike on campuses. While not opposed in principle to a nationwide strike of students, SDS objected to the manner in which the strike had been called on the grounds that it did not accord with their procedures and, secondly, that the strike was not the best strategy for developing a solid radical movement in the U.S.

At the Chicago conference one of SDS's official delegates objected to "one-shot" operations such as the student strike and suggested instead that the delegates call for local demonstrations on April 15. Secondly, SDS's major interest was in getting the support of the delegates to oppose the 2-S military draft status which it claimed the Government was using to divide students from other youths on the basis of class privilege.

Ironically, in spite of SDS's national opposition to promoting the April 15 demonstrations, various SDS regional chapters voted to support both the Vietnam Week proposal and the April 15 demonstrations.

The committee's report stated, concerning these SDS anomalies, that because of SDS policy to welcome Communists and radicals of all types and because of the autonomous nature of its local chapters, it was to be expected that some SDS delegates whose loyalty may not actually be to SDS would vote in a manner contrary to SDS policy.

#### STUDENT MOBILIZATION COMMITTEE

The Chicago conference established a national headquarters in New York and area offices in Berkeley, Los Angeles, Chicago, Cleveland, and Nashville. These offices formed the organizational structure of the Student Mobilization Committee (SMC) which would publicize and organize the student Vietnam Week project of April 8-15.

SMC placed an ad in the January 21, 1967, issue of the Communist weekly, the *National Guardian*, promoting Vietnam Week and the demonstrations on April 15 in New York and San Francisco planned by the Spring Mobilization Committee.

On January 28, SMC held a meeting of its continuations committee in New York to answer charges made by this committee's chairman that Vietnam Week was being promoted by an assortment of Communists, fellow travelers, Marxists, radicals, and professional "peace" agitators.

Addressing this session were Stokely Carmichael, then chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC); James Bevel, a leader in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC); and Sidney Peck, professor of sociology at Western Reserve University and vice chairman of the Spring Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam. Communists and radicals of various political ideologies and groups also addressed the continuations committee.

The significant aspect of this meeting was the revelation that SMC had been also working on the high school level. The delegates, for example, were told that 40 high schools in New York had been con-

tacted and that a meeting had been slated on February 4 for high school delegates. Other high school groups were also being proselytized in Seattle, San Francisco, and Philadelphia.

Beginning with its first issue of *The Student Mobilizer*, SMC brought the racial issue to the fore by propagandizing such articles as "Black People and the Many Wars" which, in denouncing the war in Vietnam, said that black people were the "cannon fodder."

SMC's New York headquarter's staff was run by Paul Friedman, former chairman of the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs' chapter at the State University College of New York at New Paltz; Linda Dannenberg, a University of New Hampshire graduate who was a coordinator for SMC and who also served on the staff of the Fifth Avenue Peace Parade Committee, another anti-Vietnam war group led by a mixture of identified Communists, fellow travelers, and professional pacifists; Gus Horowitz, a writer for *The Militant*, published by the Trotskyist Communist SWP; Bill Snyder, a member of the SDS chapter of the City College of New York.

The West Coast office of SMC, working under the direction of Miss Aptheker, operated out of two offices. One unit was located at the Berkeley office of the headquarters for the Women for Peace, a group formed in 1961 which enjoys the complete support of the CPUSA. Many of the members of this women's anti-Vietnam war organization had been or are members of the Communist Party.

The other West Coast office of SMC, located in San Francisco, is situated at the same office as that of the Spring Mobilization Committee.

The Berkeley headquarters of the Communist Socialist Workers Party is also utilized by the SMC for activities related to Vietnam Week.

SMC's Chicago office, which used the facilities of the Chicago Peace Council, distributed material on Vietnam Week which contained a return coupon. The telephone number on this coupon, committee information revealed, was registered in the name of three women, one of whom was Jacqueline "Jackie" Goldberg. Miss Goldberg attended the Fifth World Congress of Women held in Moscow in 1963 under the auspices of the Women's International Democratic Federation (WIDF), a worldwide Communist front founded in 1945 to promote the Soviet party line. Miss Goldberg was also associated with Miss Aptheker in the leadership of the Free Speech Movement at the University of California.

#### SPRING MOBILIZATION COMMITTEE

A parallel undertaking, similar in its anti-American goals to those of SMC, was that conducted by SMC's adult counterpart, the Spring Mobilization Committee—successor to the November 8 Mobilization Committee for Peace in Vietnam, for Human Rights, and for Economic Justice.

The Spring Mobilization Committee was formed at a meeting held in Cleveland, Ohio, on November 26, 1966. The Communist publication, *Challenge*, an organ of the Peking-oriented Progressive Labor Party, characterized the gathering as a "new national peace organization" which was a "coalition of Communist Party revisionists [i.e.,

[CPUSA members], trotskyites \* \* \*, and liberal-nacifists of the Muste variety." Of the 150 persons attending this founding meeting, *Challenge* reported, less than 30 were not dominated by the above three groups.

While the initial organizational meeting of the Spring Mobilization Committee was controlled from its inception, its Communist founders made sure that not one top official was a known Communist. Communists, who gave all-out support to the new organization's anti-American program, succeeded to some degree in hoodwinking sincere pacifists, liberals, and critics of U.S. policy in Vietnam. Such persons supported the Communist-controlled April 15 demonstrations, but for reasons other than those which motivated the Communists. The latter promoted these activities primarily as a means of undermining the United States and furthering Communist interests not only in Vietnam, but all over the world.

The president of Spring Mobilization Committee was the late A. J. Muste of the Fellowship of Reconciliation. Muste had been described by the Director of the FBI as a man "who has long fronted for Communists."

Edward Keating, a vice chairman of the committee, was the founder, publisher, and editor of *Ramparts*, the magazine which published material highly damaging to U.S. security operations.

Another vice chairman, David Dellinger, editor of *Liberation*, which Muste had once edited, was a supporter of the pro-Castro Fair Play for Cuba Committee. In the fall of 1966 he went to Moscow, Peking, and Hanoi without an official validation of his passport by the Government.

A third vice chairman was Sidney M. Peck, described above, who is a member of the executive council of the Inter-University Committee for Debate on Foreign Policy (IUC).

A fourth vice chairman was Robert Greenblatt, a leader of the IUC.

In addition to Miss Aptheker, the prime mover behind SMC, the Spring Mobilization Committee was sponsored by Albert J. Lima, chairman of the Northern California District of the Communist Party; Arnold Johnson, public relations director of the Communist Party; James R. ("Bob") Lindsay, Communist Party candidate for city councilman of San Jose, Calif.; Ben Dobbs, a leader of the Southern California District of the Communist Party; Robert Treuhaft and Benjamin Dreyfus, attorneys who have been identified as members of the Communist Party; identified Communist Party members Malvina Reynolds, Don Rothenberg, and Al Richmond, executive editor of the Communist Party's West Coast newspaper, *People's World*; and Peter Camejo, a leader of the Vietnam Day Committee, who had run for the office of mayor of Berkeley on the Socialist Workers Party ticket. Camejo was the former national secretary and organizer of the Trotskyist organization's youth group, the Young Socialist Alliance.

Communist activity in support of the Spring Mobilization Committee was blatant, such as that of Al Richmond, who mailed letters promoting it on *People's World* stationery.

Organizations represented by the Spring Mobilization Committee's officers and sponsors included—in addition to the Communist Party, the Socialist Workers Party, Young Socialist Alliance, and Vietnam Day Committee—such groups as the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of

America, National Lawyers Guild, and the Communist-controlled International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union.

The national office of the Spring Mobilization Committee was located in New York City.

The West Coast office of the Spring Mobilization Committee, located in San Francisco, was directed by Kipp Dawson of YSA. Investigation by this House committee indicated that the principal support for this office and its operations had come from the Trotskyist Communist organization, the Socialist Workers Party. However, Don Rothenberg, an identified member of the CPUSA and leader of Californians for Liberal Representation, had been active in the Spring Mobilization Committee on the West Coast.

All Communist parties and fronts, except the Progressive Labor Party and groups which it controlled, went all out in support of the Spring Mobilization Committee and its planned New York City-San Francisco demonstrations on April 15.

The purpose, strategy, and tactics of the Spring Mobilization Committee were clearly spelled out in an article by the late A. J. Muste which appeared in the very first issue of the committee's official publication, *Mobilizer*. The article was entitled "Cleveland And After."

Referring to "Johnson and the war-machine," Muste wrote: "Our task is to disarm them, not to be morally and politically disarmed by them."

He wrote of the need for a broader peace movement and the need for more coordination to accomplish this objective and that of forcing U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam. There was no evidence, he said, that millions of people could be brought out into the streets to demand an end to the war. Before this could be done their group would have had to win over large numbers of "labor unionists." However, Muste wrote, if they could get tens or hundreds of thousands of labor unionists to appear on the streets in an antiwar demonstration—

strikes in war industries would become possible, even likely, and that would take the protest out of the "token" or "symbolic" category.

In further discussing the problem of broadening the base of the antiwar movement, Muste candidly wrote:

To state the problem in my own terms, some who call for broadening the base, talking to other people than ourselves, etc. mean primarily the "man in the street," ordinary run of American citizens. They think of these people as well-meaning but deceived and ill-informed about what is going on in Vietnam. They conclude that these people must be approached with a "moderate" program. They will be impressed by the names of public figures as "sponsors" of our action. These people, "neighbors of ours" must be systematically reached. They tend to be scared off by the more "communist", therefore, we should dilute, cover up, possibly—some might perhaps say—in a pinch sacrifice [sic] our "non-exclusion" policy in order to gain mass support.

He then pointed out that at the Cleveland conference, at which the Spring Mobilization Committee was formed, the group's nonexclusion policy was not openly challenged. He made it clear that he did not think it would be effective to drop this policy in an effort to reach "ordinary Americans" because there wasn't much hope of doing this. Rather, he said, the Spring Mobilization Committee had to make "creative contacts" with—



the radical sections of the civil rights movement such as CORE and SNCC, both nationally and in localities throughout the country. These people do not need to be "converted" to an anti-war position.

A second group consists of youth, including students. This takes in Students for a Democratic Society and also various left-oriented political groups. There are projects such as a proposed Student Strike anti-draft campaigns, etc., which need to be taken into account.

Muste urged the Spring Mobilization Committee to adhere firmly to its policy of welcoming Communists into its ranks. He wrote:

Finally, the policy of "non-exclusion" is not to be tampered with in any way. \* \* \*

We adhere to the policy of "non-exclusion," first and most of all, because it is right in principle \* \* \*. People of the Left (Communists with or without quotation marks) should be permitted and expected to function normally in the political life of the country.

\* \* \* \* \*

In practice a non-Communist coalition is in danger of becoming an anti-Communist one \* \* \*.

Muste admitted openly that if the Spring Mobilization Committee and the antiwar movement were to bar Communists they would collapse. He wrote:

What no doubt clinches the matter is that if we were to abandon the "non-exclusion" principle we would quickly disintegrate. \* \* \*

Bettina Aptheker and the other Communists who played a major role in organizing SMC's Chicago conference were, naturally, knowledgeable of the attitude of the leaders and the plans of the Spring Mobilization Committee. There was no question about the fact that the week of April 8-15 was eventually chosen as Vietnam Week primarily, if not exclusively, because the Spring Mobilization Committee had designated April 15 as the day of its massive demonstrations against the U.S. role in Vietnam.

The student Vietnam Week served as a buildup for these demonstrations. The Spring Mobilization Committee, in turn, gave its all-out support to Vietnam Week and worked hand in glove with the Student Mobilization Committee.

### CONCLUSIONS

The proposal for a nationwide student strike was completely Communist in origin, the report concluded.

The Chicago conference, at which the decision to stage Vietnam Week (April 8-15, 1967) was made, was instigated and dominated by the Communist Party, U.S.A., and the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America.

By careful selection of a limited list of national sponsors, a deliberate effort had been made in the printed "A Call to Vietnam Week" to conceal the major role the Communists had played in organizing and promoting this project.

Communist organizations, the Communist press, Communist fronts, and individual Communists were united in giving their all-out support to Vietnam Week and all the activities and demonstrations associated with it.

They played dominant roles in both the Student Mobilization Committee and the Spring Mobilization Committee. Further, these two

organizations had unified their efforts and cooperated completely in their mutual purpose of staging on April 15 the largest demonstrations against the war in Vietnam ever to take place in this country.

The immediate objective of Vietnam Week and the April 15 demonstrations had been to reverse the U.S. policy of resisting communism in Vietnam.

The constant professions of a desire for "peace" which appeared in the literature and publicity related to Vietnam Week were completely insincere; the real, ultimate aim of the controlling Communist element in this movement was not peace, but the undermining of the United States, the destruction of any possibility of establishing a stable democratic government in Vietnam, the promotion of a Communist takeover in Vietnam, and the general advance of world communism, particularly in the Far East.

The organization and planning of the Vietnam Week demonstrations provided an excellent example of successful implementation by the Communists of their "united front" strategy.

Dr. Martin Luther King's agreement to play a leading role in the April 15 demonstrations in New York City and his releasing of Rev. James Bevel from his key position in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference to head up the Spring Mobilization Committee were evidence that the Communists had succeeded, at least partially, in implementing their strategy of fusing the Vietnam and civil rights issues in order to strengthen their chances of bringing about a reversal of U.S. policy in Vietnam.

Pacifist elements were involved in the Vietnam Week activities of the Student Mobilization Committee, the Spring Mobilization Committee, and its predecessor, the November 8 Mobilization Committee for Peace in Vietnam. Generally speaking, however, genuine pacifist elements and organizations in this country are relatively small and weak. Alone, they have never succeeded in staging a major demonstration. While the sincerity of pacifist groups in agitating for peace in Vietnam and elsewhere may be unquestioned, it was clear that they played a minor role in Vietnam Week and in other anti-Vietnam-war demonstrations which have taken place in this country in recent years.

Every major, large-scale demonstration against the war in Vietnam which has taken place in this country has had all-out Communist support. They have, in fact, achieved the status of "large-scale" and "major" mainly because of the effort put into them by Communist elements, as Muste implicitly conceded.

The success of the Communist united front strategy, which was clearly evident in the Vietnam Week program, indicated that much needs to be done, particularly on the college level, to inform the youth of America about both the principles on which the Government of this country is based and the nature, record, strategy, and tactics of communism. No person who is truly dedicated to freedom, liberty, and the concept of democratic government, who opposes tyranny and totalitarianism—and, at the same time, is truly informed about the nature and record of communism—joins willfully in any united front operation with Communists.

Such success as the instigators and organizers of Vietnam Week may have in staging anti-U.S. demonstrations during April 8-15, 1967, and in turning out large numbers of people for the New York and

San Francisco demonstrations must be attributed primarily to the Communist's ability to influence and manipulate non-Communist Americans, the report noted.

The Communist propaganda apparatus throughout the world, the report said, would capitalize in every way possible on the Vietnam Week and the April 15 demonstrations. The global publicity given to these events by the Communist propaganda machine was intended to have the following effects:

(a) Give aid and comfort to Communists everywhere, particularly in Vietnam.

(b) Tend to create, among non-Communists, the false impression that a truly large segment of the U.S. population was vehemently opposed to this country's policy in Vietnam.

(c) Pose U.S. leaders with greater difficulties in convincing our allies of the correctness of this country's policy in Vietnam.

#### VIETNAM WEEK POSTSCRIPT

On May 8, 1967, Mr. Edwin Willis, chairman of this committee, in remarks on the floor of the House, presented a brief followup report on the study "Communist Origin and Manipulation of Vietnam Week."

Mr. Willis pointed out that the Communist Premier of North Vietnam, Pham Van Dong, replying to a telegram sent by the organizers of Vietnam Week, thanked them for the "valuable support" which they had given to his country. Elsewhere throughout the world, as predicted, Communist propaganda capitalized on Vietnam Week and the concluding New York-San Francisco demonstrations.

Concerning the student portion of Vietnam Week, particularly Miss Aptheker's brainchild, the well-publicized nationwide student strike, Mr. Willis noted that it had to be scuttled because it was a complete flop. Even on the campuses of a few key universities—which the Communists thought could be counted upon—strikes failed to materialize. Other proposed projects on the campuses also received negligible student support across the country.

Spring Mobilization Committee's demonstrations on the East and West Coasts fared little better than SMC's Vietnam Week, considering the pre-April 15 fanfare and planning the twin activities had received.

In spite of the optimistic prediction by its proponents of 1,000,000 participants at the April 15 twin demonstrations, shared equally at 500,000 each by the two activities, the New York City Police Department estimated that only 100,000 to 125,000 persons took part in New York. Meanwhile, in San Francisco only about 23,000 persons marched on April 15 and approximately 60,000 assembled in the so-called mammoth turnout at that city's Kezar Stadium. West Coast marchers represented less than one-twentieth of those expected to attend.

The CPUSA, ignoring the official estimates of actual attendance, grossly exaggerated the attendance figures with a type of arithmetic peculiar to itself. Moscow and Hanoi, in comradely fashion, utilized these blown-up figures in their anti-American propaganda.

Nevertheless, while the number of participants on April 15 was considerably less than claimed, the Communists did manage to stage one of the largest antiwar exhibitions ever held in the U.S.

A contingent representing the Communist Party, U.S.A., led by party boss Gus Hall and other leading party officials, marched openly for the first time since 1949 in the New York City parade.

The Communist Party and other Communist groups such as the Socialist Workers Party were in evidence near the assembly point in Central Park where they had set up literature tables. Viet Cong flags were also displayed throughout the line of march. Leaflets calling for a Viet Cong victory were distributed by a radical group called the Ad Hoc Committee for a Revolutionary Contingent.

Interestingly, Michael Laski, secretary of a group called the Communist Party U.S.A. (Marxist-Leninist), ideological opponent of the orthodox CPUSA, bitterly stated in a press interview on April 14 that the latter and the Socialist Workers Party controlled the April 15 protest.

The Black United Action Front, a group composed of black nationalist organizations and elements of the Progressive Labor Party and the Socialist Workers Party, also participated, the chairman stated.

The officially approved propaganda slogans for the march included: "Cease Fire Now—Negotiate With the NLF"; "End the Draft—Let Young Men Live." Other slogan signs, more militant in content, included: "L.B.J.: Go To Hell"; "Hell No, We Won't Go"; "Hey, L.B.J., How Many Kids Did You Kill Today?"

Some demonstrators, on April 15, burned their draft cards and even the American flag in the New York City demonstration. Swastikas were also placed over reproductions of the U.S. flag in order to imply that the U.S.A. is a Nazi-like nation.

Speakers at the rally in the United Nations Plaza included Dr. Benjamin Spock, Dr. Martin Luther King, Floyd McKissick, Stokely Carmichael, Linus Pauling, Mrs. Dagmar Wilson, and Rev. James Bevel, Spring Mobilization Committee's national director and official aide to Dr. King. Identified Communist Party member, Pete Seeger, provided the entertainment for the New York activity.

A former official of the Communist Progressive Labor Party aptly described the marchers as "an odd lot." Communists, ultraleftists, left liberals, sincere pacifists, and hippies dominated the street. The protestors, who looked like characters out of the "Three Penny Opera," were "led down the parade route by the Communist Judas goats," he wrote.

The demonstration in San Francisco was even more of a ludicrous spectacle than the one held in New York. To beef up the attendance, the Communists had to rely heavily on the West Coast beatnik element and the tambourine and bongo drum-playing hippies from San Francisco's odious Haight-Ashbury district.

Steve Murdock, columnist for the Communist Party's West Coast newspaper, *People's World*, conceded that "The people connected with the mobilization who threw around loose and enormous figures [i.e., 1/2 million] about the number of participants did their cause no service."

The substance of the West Coast slogans reflected the pathetic character of the Spring Mobilization Committee as much as the hippie demonstrators themselves. One sign stated, "Where is Oswald now that we need him?" Another, in obvious reference to the vicious parody play, "MacBird," read, "Who killed Kennedy?"

Stokely Carmichael, in a telegram sent to the motley gathering at Kezar Stadium in San Francisco on April 15, accused the United States of genocide in Vietnam.

Speakers at the Kezar Stadium rally included Edward Keating, publisher of *Ramparts* magazine and West Coast chairman of the Spring Mobilization Committee; Robert Vaughn, a T.V. actor; Rabbi Abraham Feinberg of Toronto, who had made a trip to North Vietnam; Eldridge Cleaver, Bay Area chairman of the Organization of Afro-American Unity, and Mrs. Grace Mora Newman, sister of Dennis Mora—one of the “Fort Hood Three” GI’s who refused to go to Vietnam—who also had traveled to North Vietnam.

Folksingers Judy Collins and Malvina Reynolds, the latter an identified Communist Party member, provided the entertainment.

The chairman’s Vietnam Week postscript stated that despite the efforts of the Communists and the leadership and support from Martin Luther King, Stokely Carmichael, Floyd McKissick, and others, Negro attendance, as the press had observed, was very small. Moreover, Negro participation was primarily composed of black nationalist and leftist elements who represent only a small minority among the Negro population.

Mr. Willis stated that it was his conviction that the overall result of the Vietnam Week demonstrations would be a pro-American “backlash.” The American people, of whatever racial derivation, have never been impressed by Communists, fellow travelers, and “a motley collection of unkempt hippies and beatniks” and cowardly draft card and flag burners.

American citizens have been revolted and disgusted by the misfits of society who comprised the majority of people participating in the April 15 demonstrations, Chairman Willis said.

But as General Westmoreland pointed out in his address to the Congress, the enemy in Vietnam, although discouraged by military defeats, was encouraged by what he believes to be popular opposition in America to the U.S. effort in Vietnam. The Communist Vietnamese, therefore, would continue to press their aggression from the north and this in turn would cost additional lives, both American and allied.

#### THE PRESENT-DAY KU KLUX KLAN MOVEMENT

On the basis of 36 days of public hearings in the winter of 1965–1966 and information developed from staff investigations, the committee reported that klan organizations operated as conspiracies to deprive certain citizens of rights guaranteed by the Constitution and that they relied on terrorism to achieve their objectives.

A 371-page report on “The Present-Day Ku Klux Klan Movement,” released December 11, 1967, summarized the evidence obtained by the committee during a 2-year period of investigations into klan activities in the United States.

After sketching the 100-year history of klan activity in the United States, the report examined each of the 15 ku klux klan organizations operating at the time of the committee’s public hearings. The origin, location, and leadership of each of the klans were set forth, as well as the approximate size and distribution of its membership.

The major portion of the report was devoted to the largest klan, the United Klans of America, Inc., headed by Imperial Wizard Robert M. Shelton. The committee established that this klan had 15,075 members or 90 percent of the total klan membership of 16,810 in the United States as of early 1967.

The committee described modern klans as relatively short-lived. The continuous organization and then disbandment of klans ever since World War II was illustrated by the appearance of three new independent klans following the close of the committee's hearings in February 1966. The report listed 658 klaverns (local klan units) and 56 ladies auxiliaries which, committee investigation disclosed, had been in operation within the period 1964-1966. Most of the klaverns were located in Southern States, although some organized klan activity was reported in seven Northern States, with Michigan the northernmost.

The report reviewed the operations of Shelton's United Klans of America in 17 States and explained how State and national offices were regularly supplied with funds from initiation fees, monthly membership dues, sale of robes and other paraphernalia, and solicitations at public rallies. The report charged that Imperial Wizard Shelton disbursed funds from the national klan bank account "as he saw fit" and that the national klan was guilty of tax evasion for failing to report total income. The Federal corporate income tax return of the United Klans listed a gross income of \$18,487.60 for the 1965 fiscal year, although gross income in that period must have exceeded \$100,000, the report deduced.

Some klans, including Shelton's organization, engaged in considerable public activity for the purpose of building up their membership, their treasuries, or their influence. Such activity involved cow pasture rallies, klan walks and motorcades, picketing, boycotts, literature distribution, and "politicking."

The "cornerstone" of every klan's structure, however, was secrecy, which was impressed upon each klansman from the moment he took his oath of allegiance to "die rather than divulge" information about the klan, the report stated. Elaborate security precautions taken by klansmen were described, including klansmen's reliance on citizens band radios. Within various klans, there were secret "action" groups, the composition of which was concealed from the general klan membership. These groups were responsible for most of the violence and other extra-legal activity of the particular klan organization, the report said. Cited as examples of such groups were the Underground, formed within the South Carolina Realm of the United Klans, and the White Band, operating within the United Klans Georgia Realm.

The klokann and intelligence committees of local United Klans klaverns often served as strong-arm squads entrusted with planning and executing acts of intimidation. Similar functions were assigned to the "wrecking crews" of the Original Knights of the Ku Klux Klan in Louisiana and to the Klan Bureau of Investigation of the White Knights of the Ku Klux Klan in Mississippi. Secrecy was such a fetish with the Mississippi White Knights that the entire operation of this klan was underground, the report noted. Klans have enforced secrecy not only through oaths administered to initiates, but also through the use of threats, harassment, and outright physical violence against klansmen and their families.

Klans were likened to the Communist Party in the use of cover names and front organizations to conceal from the public the klan's true role in certain political, agitational, and propaganda activities. Many klaverns functioned in local communities under cover names

which gave them the appearance of hunting, fishing, or rifle clubs or civic associations. The report also called attention to a klan habit of forming and maintaining control over "front" organizations to carry out a specific task. An example of such a front for the United Klans of America was the Whiteman's Defense Fund, which had aided defendants in the Viola Liuzzo murder case.

The covert nature of a klan has permitted klansmen to infiltrate certain areas, thus substantially increasing its influence and power, according to the report. Concealed klansmen, it was observed, have been elected to such public offices as State legislator and mayor and have obtained appointments to positions of trust within State or local governmental subdivisions, including law enforcement agencies. The report expressed the opinion that even a minor infiltration of police and sheriffs' departments was harmful to the entire law enforcement community.

Secrecy has also facilitated klan vigilante actions, the report stated. Intimidation, it was noted, is a basic way of life for every klan and it has assumed a variety of forms. Klans have employed telephone threats, cross-burnings, kidnaping, beating, arson, bombing, and murder to coerce Americans—through fear—to conform with a pattern of behavior approved by the klan, the report declared. A chapter in the report recounts specific cases which illustrate the various ways in which klans have repeatedly flouted the law to spread death, destruction, and fear in many Southern communities in recent years.

Among the examples of intimidation were the threats and petty harassment which one klan directed against officials and leading citizens of Bogalusa, La., and which had the intended effects of (1) canceling a speech by a former Congressman on improving race relations and (2) driving a radio station owner out of business. In the same category was the propagation of scurrilous klan charges aimed at discrediting a Laurel, Miss., mayor opposed to klan violence. Cross-burnings in Greenville, N.C., and Griffin, Ga., were described as klan responses to property owners' efforts at interracial cooperation.

Klan-administered beatings of civil rights workers in various municipalities in Louisiana and Mississippi were recounted, with the further observation that klansmen have also ordered their victims flogged for some alleged "moral" offense.

The committee reported that its investigations had definitely established klan involvement in the majority of 25 bombings and/or acts of arson which occurred in the vicinity of McComb, Miss., between April and October 1964. Other activities cited as klan engineered included bombings of newspapers in Laurel and Jackson, Miss.; numerous churches in Louisiana; an Alabama clay pipe manufacturing firm; a North Carolina funeral home; and the residence of a 6-year-old Negro boy who was the first of his race to enroll in a Jacksonville, Fla., elementary school.

Murder cases cited as involving klansmen included the fatal shootings of Lt. Col. Lemuel Penn in Georgia and Mrs. Viola Liuzzo in Alabama; the killing of three civil rights workers near Philadelphia, Miss.; and the arson-murder of Vernon Dahmer at Hattiesburg, Miss.

The committee stated that arrests of klansmen have frequently led to the discovery of sizable caches of arms, including handguns, shotguns, supplies of dynamite and blasting powder, and homemade

bombs. A number of active klansmen were reported to possess Federal licenses to sell firearms, thus assuring the klan a source of supply for their membership in those localities. Klans also provided courses of instruction for their members in the use of firearms and explosive devices, the committee said.

Reproduced as exhibits in the report were three mimeographed directives which had been secretly circulated among the White Knights of the Ku Klux Klan and which were, in effect, manuals for klan terrorists. The documents referred to the Mississippi klansmen as soldiers at war with an enemy and recommended that local klan units study books on guerrilla warfare. The "enemy," which included civil rights workers, was to be destroyed "socially" or "economically" and, it was recommended, if such means failed, to be physically annihilated.

A chapter on the personalities within the various klans offered the opinion that the organizations appeared to attract individuals of less than exemplary character. Some klan officers and members had records of arrests and convictions on criminal charges, the report pointed out, and many others had histories of financial irregularities, ranging from petty theft to bad debts, alcoholism, gambling, psychological problems, and associations with other extremist groups such as the American Nazi Party. The committee listed four basic features which attracted potential officers to the klan: financial rewards, an opportunity to exercise power over others, publicity, and an outlet for extremists' views and hatreds.

Although some persons of responsibility in certain communities held klan membership, they were in a minority, the report stated. Most rank-and-file klansmen, it was noted, were uneducated individuals who were unable to attain the social status they desired and who were driven by their hatred of minority groups such as Negroes, Jews, and Catholics.

The report reiterated Chairman Willis' warning on the floor of the House of Representatives:

Any group that engages in organized, large-scale intimidation in the political, economic and social fields and terrorizes individuals and groups attacks the very root of the democratic process. \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

Democracy cannot coexist with terror. The two are incompatible. One or the other must go.

Hope was expressed that the committee report would alert the Congress and the American public to the evils of modern klancraft and lead to a firm resolve by all Americans, north and south, to repudiate klans and their methods.



### **CHAPTER III**

#### **REFERENCE SERVICE FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS**

During the year 1967, the reference section answered 759 requests from Members of Congress, 269 from Federal and other agencies, and 1,732 in connection with committee investigations, hearings, and research projects.

Checks were made on 2,842 individuals and 914 organizations and subjects. Written reports on 1,676 individuals and 716 organizations and subjects were supplied in response to requests made.

1,735 reproductions were prepared and 1,139 items of material were loaned for use in committee hearings and reports and for Members of Congress.

Twenty executive branch agencies made over 1,500 visits to the committee in connection with their security operations.

## CHAPTER IV

### BIBLIOGRAPHY OF COMMITTEE PUBLICATIONS FOR THE YEAR 1967

During the year 1967, the committee distributed 52,317 copies of its publications to Members of Congress, Government agencies, and private individuals and organizations.

The committee had a total of 84,648 copies of its publications available for distribution during 1967. This total included 28,202 documents printed and received prior to 1967 and 56,446 copies of hearings and reports printed and received in 1967. Of the 56,446 copies received in 1967, 10,500 were reprints of previously released documents such as "Communist Origin and Manipulation of Vietnam Week," which was released on March 31, 1967, and the supply of which was very shortly exhausted.

The following is a list of publications released by the committee during the first session of the 90th Congress:

#### HEARINGS

- Activities of Ku Klux Klan Organizations in the United States, Part 1, October 19, 20, 21, 22, and 25, 1965.
- Activities of Ku Klux Klan Organizations in the United States, Part 2, October 26-28 and November 1-4 and 9, 1965.
- Activities of Ku Klux Klan Organizations in the United States, Part 3, January 4-7, 11-14, 18, and 28, 1966.
- Activities of Ku Klux Klan Organizations in the United States, Part 4, February 1-4 and 7-11, 1966.
- Activities of Ku Klux Klan Organizations in the United States, Part 5, February 14, 15, 21, 23, and 24, 1966; September 29, July 28, August 24, and October 6, 1965; and January 28, 1966.
- Communist Activities in the Central California Area, July 12, 1964, and April 27 and 28, 1966.
- Hearings Relating to H.R. 10390, H.R. 10391, and H.R. 10681, Amending the Internal Security Act of 1950, August 15-18, 1967.
- The New Communist Propaganda Line on Religion, August 10, 1967.
- Conduct of Espionage within the United States by Agents of Foreign Communist Governments, April 6 and 7, May 10, June 15, and November 15, 1967.
- Subversive Influences in Riots, Looting, and Burning, Part 1, October 25, 26, and 31 and November 28, 1967.
- Subversive Influences in Riots, Looting, and Burning, Part 2, October 31 and November 1, 1967.
- Subversive Influences in Riots, Looting, and Burning, Part 3, November 28, 29, and 30, 1967.

# REPORTS

Communist Origin and Manipulation of Vietnam Week (April 8-15, 1967), House Document No. 186, 90th Congress, first session, original release date March 31, 1967.

Obstruction of Armed Forces, Report No. 326, May 31, 1967.

Organizational Conspiracies Act of 1967, Report No. 648, September 19, 1967.

Internal Security Act of 1950 Amendments, Report No. 733, October 4, 1967.

The Present-Day Ku Klux Klan Movement, December 11, 1967.

Freedom Commission and Freedom Academy, Report No. 1050, December 15, 1967.

Annual Report for the Year 1967.

## CONFERENCE REPORT

Amending the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, Report No. 1038, December 12, 1967.

CHAPTER V  
CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS

*Milton Mitchell Cohen, Yolanda Hall, and Jeremiah Stamler* had still not been tried for contempt of Congress as of the end of 1967, their trials having been delayed pending the outcome of civil actions the three had brought against the committee in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

Cohen, Hall, and Stamler were cited for contempt by the House in October 1966, and reports of their contempt certified by the Speaker to the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois. Contempt indictments were returned by the grand jury against each of them on July 18, 1967. They had been subpoenaed to testify before a subcommittee of this committee which was conducting hearings in Chicago, Ill., in May 1965 on the subject of Communist Party activities in the Chicago area and Illinois District of the Communist Party. Each of the witnesses, having appeared, answered certain preliminary questions, but refused to testify further and departed the hearings without leave of the subcommittee. None of the witnesses asserted the self-incrimination provisions of the fifth amendment for his or her refusal to testify.

Developments in the two civil actions instituted by Stamler and Hall, as plaintiffs, and Cohen, as intervening plaintiff, have been as follows:

On May 24, 1965, the day before the commencement of the committee's aforesaid public hearings in Chicago, the said plaintiffs, who had been subpoenaed for the Chicago hearings, brought a civil action against the members of the committee by which they sought a judgment declaring their subpoenas and the proposed hearings invalid, declaring Rule XI unconstitutional, and to enjoin the defendants from executing Rule XI and instituting any contempt proceedings against them. The plaintiffs also moved for the convening of a three-judge court.

On the same day the district judge refused to convene a three-judge court and dismissed the action for failure of plaintiffs to state a justiciable controversy.

After the close of the subcommittee's hearings in Chicago, a second civil action, containing substantially the same averments and request for relief as the first (but alleging matters occurring at the public hearings) was filed by the plaintiffs on December 6, 1965. The court dismissed this action likewise.

The plaintiffs appealed both civil actions, and the cases were consolidated on appeal. On November 10, 1966, the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit reversed the district court in both actions, vacated the judgment, and granted the plaintiffs' request for the convening of a three-judge district court. The court of appeals did

so on the ground that a substantial constitutional question was presented by the complaints, which required that the actions be determined by a three-judge court pursuant to title 28, U.S. Code, sections 2281-2.

Subsequently, on motion of the plaintiffs, the three-judge court, which was convened pursuant to the mandate of the court of appeals, ordered the Attorney General of the United States and the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois to be joined in the civil actions as additional parties defendant. The plaintiffs seek particularly to enjoin the defendants from proceeding with the prosecution against the plaintiffs on the criminal side of the court under the aforesaid indictments.

At year's end the civil actions were pending before a three-judge district court, before which the defendants have renewed their motions for summary judgment and dismissal of the complaints.

#### UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

The appeal of *Robert M. Shelton* from his conviction for contempt of Congress was still pending in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia at the end of 1967. The appeal had been argued and briefs filed, but the court had not yet handed down its decision.

*Robert M. Shelton, Calvin Fred Craig, James R. Jones, Marshall R. Kornegay, Robert E. Scoggin, Robert Hudgins, and George Franklin Dorsett* were cited for contempt by the House on February 2, 1966. The reports of their citation were certified by the Speaker to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, pursuant to the provisions of title 2, U.S. Code, section 194. Contempt indictments were returned by the grand jury in the District of Columbia against each of them on March 3, 1966. The said persons had been subpoenaed to testify and produce papers in October 1965 in the course of the committee's investigation of various Klan organizations. They refused to produce the papers demanded of them by the subpoenas, asserting various legal and constitutional privileges as a basis for their refusal, including invocation of the self-incrimination provisions of the fifth amendment.

Robert M. Shelton was tried by a jury in September of 1966 and found guilty. On October 14, 1966, he was sentenced to imprisonment for 1 year and fined \$1,000. He appealed his conviction to the United States Court of Appeals.

Calvin Fred Craig, James R. Jones, and Robert E. Scoggin entered pleas of guilty to their indictments on November 18, 1966. It was agreed that the sentence for each would be held in abeyance pending disposition of the appeal of Robert M. Shelton, with the stipulation that if a final judgment on the law in Shelton's case results in a dismissal of his indictment, the Government shall consent to a withdrawal of their guilty pleas and shall move to dismiss their indictments.

Pleas of not guilty were entered to the indictments of Marshall R. Kornegay, Robert Hudgins, and George Franklin Dorsett. The Government has agreed to hold their trials in abeyance pending disposition of the Shelton case which, as indicated above, has not yet been decided.

## CHAPTER VI

### LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

The following legislation is recommended :

#### I

That it be made a Federal offense, whether or not a formal state of war exists, to give, solicit, or receive from another any money, property, or thing for delivery to, or for the use of, any foreign power, organization, or group engaged in armed conflict with the United States, with the intent to impede or interfere with the operation or success of the Armed Forces of the United States or in any manner to prejudice the interests of the United States.

(Provisions to this effect are included in bills introduced as follows: H.R. 8 by Mr. Pool on January 10, 1967; H.R. 250 by Mr. Bennett on January 10, 1967; H.R. 9493 by Mr. King of New York on May 1, 1967; and H.R. 10808 by Mr. Ashbrook on June 14, 1967, which were referred to the Committee on Un-American Activities. H.R. 8 was favorably reported without amendment (Report No. 326) on May 31, 1967. A resolution (H. Res. 509) for consideration of the bill was reported by the Committee on Rules on June 13, 1967, and adopted by the House on November 17, 1967.)

#### II

That it can be made a Federal offense, when the United States is engaged in armed conflict abroad, to obstruct the free movement of military personnel or supplies with the intent to impede or interfere with the United States or members of the Armed Forces in preparing for, or carrying on, any military duty or activity.

(Provisions to this effect are contained in the above-mentioned bills, H.R. 8, H.R. 250, H.R. 9493, and H.R. 10803.)

#### III

That the President be explicitly authorized to regulate or prohibit travel by citizens of the United States to specific areas or countries when he finds that the national security interests of the United States require such action, and making the violation of such regulations or prohibitions punishable as an offense against the United States.

(See discussion, "II. Area Restraints on Travel," Annual Report for the Year 1964, p. 76, in which this committee recommended an amendment to section 1185, title 8, U.S. Code. To implement this recommendation, Mr. Willis and Mr. Ashbrook, respectively, on January 16, 1967, introduced H.R. 2430 and H.R. 2431, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. On December 11, 1967, the Secretary of State also transmitted proposed legislation to the Congress on this subject in the form of a draft bill, recommending its favorable

consideration. A number of bills on this subject have been introduced in this and prior sessions of the Congress by Members of the House and Senate.)

## IV

That the Secretary of State be authorized to deny or revoke passports, or to grant restricted passports, to persons who, in traveling abroad, will likely engage in activities to further the purposes of the world Communist movement.

(See discussion, "III. Passports," Annual Report for the Year 1964, p. 89. In partial implementation of this recommendation, the committee stresses the need for revising section 6 of the Internal Security Act of 1950, relating to the denial of passports to members of Communist organizations, which was held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court on June 22, 1964, in the case of *Aptheker and Flynn v. the Secretary of State*, 378 U.S. 500. An amendment to section 6 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 to remedy the decision in the case of *Aptheker and Flynn* was proposed by Mr. Willis and Mr. Ashbrook, who respectively introduced H.R. 5942 on February 21, 1967, and H.R. 6134 on February 27, 1967, which were referred to the Committee on Un-American Activities.)

## V

That section 5(a)(1)(D) of the Internal Security Act of 1950, which prohibits the employment of a member of a Communist-action organization in any defense facility, be amended so as to remedy the Supreme Court's decision of December 11, 1967, in the case of *United States v. Eugene Frank Robel*, which voided the aforesaid provision of the act prohibiting such employment.

## VI

That the Internal Security Act of 1950 be amended so as to embrace within its terms certain Marxist-Leninist organizations which have emerged with notable strength within recent years and, although adhering to the purposes and objectives of the world Communist movement, are not presently within the terms of the act.

## VII

That there be established a research and educational institution as an independent agency of the United States Government to assist in the development of methods and means employable in both the governmental and private sectors to counter all forms of Communist political warfare, subversion, and insurgency, while seeking to preserve and build free and viable societies, and for the education and training of governmental personnel, selected private citizens, and, under appropriate conditions, foreign nationals, in the science of Communist conflict techniques so as to increase the nonmilitary capabilities of the United States and other nations in the global struggle between freedom and communism.

(The following bills, referred to the Committee on Un-American Activities, were introduced in the House to implement the above recommendation: H.R. 281 by Mr. Boggs and H.R. 735 by Mr. Ichord on January 10, 1967; H.R. 12169 by Mr. Gubser on August 8, 1967; and

H.R. 13626 by Mr. King of New York on October 23, 1967. H.R. 735 was favorably reported without amendment on December 15, 1967. See House Report No. 1050, 90th Congress, first session, and Hearings Providing for Creation of a Freedom Commission and Freedom Academy, House Committee on Un-American Activities, 1964, parts 1 and 2, and 1965.)

### VIII

That additional Federal laws be enacted to curb certain terroristic activities of Klan-type organizations.

(For this purpose Mr. Willis and Mr. Ashbrook, respectively, introduced H.R. 7025 on March 9, 1967, and H.R. 11963 on August 1, 1967, which were referred to the Committee on Un-American Activities. H.R. 7025 was favorably reported (Report No. 648) on September 19, 1967, with amendments.)

### IX

That the Smith Act of 1940 be amended to clarify congressional intent with respect to the terms "advocate" and "teach," as indicated by the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *Yates v. United States*, 354 U.S. 298 (1957).

(See discussion, "IV. Smith Act," Annual Report for the Year 1964, p. 97.)

### X

That it be made a Federal offense for any person to misbehave or to engage in disorderly conduct in the presence of any committee or subcommittee of the Senate or House.



# INDEX

## INDIVIDUALS

	Page
<b>A</b>	
Albertson (William).....	21
Anderson, A. Leo.....	27
Anderson, Clayton R.....	60, 61
Aptheker, Bettina.....	78-80, 83, 85, 87, 99
Aptheker, Herbert.....	26, 33, 34, 80

<b>B</b>	
Baker, Michael, Jr.....	11
Bende.....	32
Bevel, James (L.).....	81, 86, 88
Bienstock, Natalie Anna.....	15-18
Bloice, Carl.....	80
Boeckenhaupt, Herbert W. (William).....	5
Borovoi.....	34
Boutenko, Vladimir.....	5
Bova (Jerold M.).....	63
Bowe, Walter.....	57
Browder, Earl.....	31
Brown, Archie.....	64, 66, 68
Brown, (H.) Rap.....	40

<b>C</b>	
Callender, Herbert.....	56
Camejo, Peter.....	83
Carmichael, Stokely.....	81, 88, 89
Clark, Tom (C.).....	28
Cleaver, Eldridge.....	89
Cohen, Milton Mitchell.....	96
Cole, Virgil.....	65, 70
Collier, Robert.....	56, 57
Collins, Judy.....	89
Craig, Calvin Fred.....	97

<b>D</b>	
Dahmer, Vernon.....	91
Dannenberg, Linda.....	82
Davidson, James J., Jr.....	27, 28
Dawson, Kipp.....	84
Deadwyler, Leonard.....	40, 60, 61, 63
Dellinger, David.....	83
Dobbs, Ben.....	83
Donaldson, Allen Eugene (also known as Allen Jamal).....	62
Dorsett, George Franklin.....	97
Dreyfus, Benjamin.....	83
Duclos, Michelle.....	57

<b>E</b>	
Epstein, Leonard I.....	7-10
Epton, William.....	53, 54

<b>F</b>	
Farmer, James (L.).....	56
Fascell, Dante B.....	30
Feinberg, Abraham.....	89
Flynn (Elizabeth Gurley).....	99
Ford, Peyton.....	28, 29
Foreman, James.....	58
Fortier, Louis J.....	22
Friedman, Paul.....	82

G

	Page
Garaudy, Roger.....	33, 34
Gardiner, James B.....	20
Gilligan (Thomas R.).....	63
Goldberg, Jacqueline (Jackie).....	82
Gray, Jesse (Willard).....	55, 56
Greenblatt, Robert.....	83
Greenwood, Frank (S.).....	62
Guevara, Ernesto "Che".....	56

H

Hall, Durward G.....	19, 20
Hall, Gus.....	21, 24, 34, 66, 72, 73, 88
Hall, Yolanda.....	96
Harman, Mildred B.....	22
Harris, James C.....	58-60
Harris, John Wesley.....	61, 63
Hart, Adolph W.....	53-55
Healey, Don.....	50
Healey, Dorothy.....	50, 69
Heisler, Robert.....	80
Hoover, J. Edgar.....	47, 52, 80, 83
Horowitz, Gus.....	82
Hudgins, Robert.....	97
Huminik, John, Jr.....	3-7

I

Iashi, Constantinescu.....	31, 32
Isakov, Vadim.....	8-10
Izvekov, Aleksandr (N.).....	4

J

Jacquette, Tommy Ray.....	62
Jamal, Allen. (See Donaldson, Allen Eugene.).....	
Johnson, Arnold.....	83
Johnson (Lyndon Baines).....	50, 84, 88
Johnson, Robert (D).....	13
Jones, Adrian H.....	42-45
Jones, James R.....	97

K

Karenga, Ron.....	62
Karpatkin, Marvin.....	22, 23
Keating, Edward (M.).....	83, 89
Kennedy (John F.).....	88
Keylor, Evangeline. (See Kilmer, Evangeline.).....	
Keylor, Howard.....	65, 70-72
Kilmer, Evangeline (Mrs. Larry Kilmer; formerly Mrs. Howard Keylor).....	65, 70-72
King, Martin Luther.....	49, 86, 88, 89
Kornegay, Marshall R.....	97
Kosygin (Aleksel).....	33
Kutnick, Lee.....	65, 70
Kuznetsov, Anatole.....	4

L

Lambert, Rude.....	65, 70
Langen, Odin.....	30
Laski, Michael Isaac.....	58, 59, 88
Lenin (V.I.).....	30, 31, 49
Lerner, Herman D.....	45-48
Lima, Albert J. (Mickey).....	66, 69, 73, 83
Lima, Mickey. (See Lima, Albert J.).....	
Lindsay, James R. (Bob).....	83
Liuzzo, Viola.....	91
Long, Speedy O.....	22
Luca, Vasile.....	34
Luce, Phillip Abbott.....	54, 55

M

	Page
Mahan, John W.....	20, 21
Malinin, Aleksy R.....	5
McAdoo, William.....	54
McKissick, Floyd (B.).....	88, 89
Mears, John S.....	24
Mehaffey, Robert H.....	53
Mitchell, Clarence.....	37, 38
Moore, Archie.....	36, 37
Mora, Dennis.....	89
Morris, Charles.....	58
Morris, Robert.....	20
Mrkva, Frank John (alias "Zobek").....	10-15
Mrkva (Mrs. Frank John).....	12, 13
Muhammad, Elijah. (See Poole, Elijah Muhammad.)	
Murdock, Steve.....	88
Musmanno, Michael A.....	25, 26, 29
Muste, A. J.....	83-86

N

Newman, Grace Mora.....	89
Noland, Leila.....	69

O

O'Connor, Daniel J.....	24
Oglesby, Carl.....	80
Opatrny, Jiri.....	12-15
Oswald (Lee Harvey).....	88

P

Patler, John.....	76
Patrashcanu.....	34
Patrashcoiu.....	32
Pauker, Ana.....	34
Pauling, Linus.....	88
Peck, Sidney M.....	81, 83
Penn, Lemuel.....	91
Pham Van Dong.....	87
Pisk, Zdenek.....	11-14
Poole, Elijah Muhammad.....	77
Proctor, Roscoe.....	73

R

Rassadin, Constantine.....	16
Revin, Valentin.....	5, 6
Reynolds, Malvina.....	83, 89
Richmond, Al.....	83
Riosheanu.....	32
Robel, Eugene Frank.....	99
Rockwell, George Lincoln.....	76-78
Romerstein, Herbert.....	55-58
Roosevelt (Franklin D.).....	75
Rothenberg, Don.....	83, 84

S

Sarnoff, Irving.....	50
Satterfield, John C.....	28
Sayyed, Khaleel.....	57
Schadeberg, Henry C.....	22
Schneiderman, William.....	68
Scoggin, Robert E.....	97
Seeger, Pete.....	88
Selden, Armistead.....	89
Shelton, Robert M.....	89, 90, 97
Sitsh (Antonina Ivanovna).....	34
Snyder, Bill.....	82
Sorin, Viktor.....	16, 17

	Page
Sorokin, Alexander ( <i>see also</i> Sorokin, Leo).....	17
Sorokin, Leo ( <i>see also</i> Sorokin, Alexander).....	17
Spaulding, Asa T.....	38
Spock, Benjamin.....	88
Stalin (Josef).....	30
Stamler, Jeremiah.....	96
Stover, Francis W.....	23, 24
Stupar, Sergei (N.).....	4-6

## T

Thompson, Howard O.....	64-68, 70
Thompson, Lulu Mae (Mrs. Howard O. Thompson).....	64-66, 68-74
Tracy, Stanley J.....	21, 22
Treuhart, Robert.....	83
Truman (Harry S.).....	19

## V

Valentine, John.....	56
Vaughn, Robert.....	89

## W

Warden, Judith.....	54, 55
Wallace, Henry (A.).....	65
Westmoreland (William C.).....	89
Wheeler, Juanita.....	73
Wheeler, William A.....	59, 60, 62, 63
Williams, Robert F.....	47
Wilson, Dagmar.....	88
Wood, Raymond.....	56, 57
Wright, Loyd.....	26, 27
Wurmbrand, Richard.....	30-34

## Y

Yates (Oleta O'Connor).....	100
Yohrling, George.....	7, 8
Yorty, Sam (Samuel W.).....	48-51, 60
Young, Whitney M., Jr.....	38
Younger, Evelle J.....	39-41

## Z

Zobek. ( <i>See</i> Mrkva, Frank John.).....	
Zorov, Vladimir.....	4, 5

## ORGANIZATIONS

## A

ABC. ( <i>See</i> Any Boy Can.).....	
ACLU. ( <i>See</i> American Civil Liberties Union.).....	
ACT.....	53
AFL-CIO. ( <i>See</i> American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations.).....	
AMVETS. ( <i>See</i> American Veterans of World War II.).....	
ASM. ( <i>See</i> American Society for Metals.).....	
Ad Hoc Committee for a Revolutionary Contingent.....	88
Ad Hoc Committee To End Police Malpractices.....	61, 62
Afro-American Cultural Association.....	62
American Bar Association.....	26, 28
American Bosch Arma Corporation.....	9
American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU).....	22, 23
American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO).....	71
Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee (AWOC).....	67
American Friends Service Committee. ( <i>See</i> entry under Religious Society of Friends.).....	
American Legion, The.....	24
National Americanism Commission.....	24
American Nazi Party ( <i>see also</i> National Socialist White People's Party).....	75-78, 92

	Page
American Ordnance Association.....	3
American Society for Mechanical Engineers (ASME).....	7
American Society for Metals (ASM).....	3-5, 7
Inter-American Relations Committee.....	4
American Veterans of World War II (AMVETS).....	27
American Welding Society.....	3-5
Any Boy Can (ABC).....	36, 37
Automobile Maintenance Workers' Union.....	59

## B

Black Anti-Draft Union.....	62
Black Arts Theater.....	57
Black Liberation Front.....	56
Black Muslims. (See Nation of Islam.)	
Black Panthers.....	19
Black United Action Front.....	88

## C

CEWV. (See Committee To End the War in Vietnam.)	
CORE. (See Congress of Racial Equality.)	
CPUSA. (See Communist Party of the United States of America.)	
CPUSA-ML. (See Communist Party U.S.A. (Marxist-Leninist).)	
Californians for Liberal Representation.....	84
Chemprox Corporation.....	3
Chicago Peace Council.....	79
Committee for the Defense of John Harris. (See Committee to Defend John Harris.)	
Committee to Defend John Harris.....	62, 63
Committee To Defend the Bill of Rights (Los Angeles).....	60
Committee To End Legalized Murder by Cops.....	61, 62
Committee To End the War in Vietnam (CEWV).....	59
Committee to Support Grievances of Watts Negroes.....	59, 60, 62
Communist Party, France.....	34
Communist Party of the United States of America (CPUSA).....	19,
21, 22, 24, 25, 28-31, 33, 49, 50, 52, 53, 55, 56, 60-71, 73, 74,	
78-80, 82-85, 87-90	
National Structure:	
National Committee.....	24, 71-73
Negro Commission.....	52
National Conventions and Conferences:	
Sixteenth Convention, February 9-12, 1957, New York City.....	66, 68
Seventeenth Convention, December 1959, New York City.....	67,
68, 71, 72	
Eighteenth Convention, June 22-26, 1966, New York City.....	21
Districts:	
Northern California District.....	63, 66, 69, 72, 73, 83
District Structure:	
District Committee.....	65-68, 70, 71, 73
Executive Board or Committee.....	67, 70, 73
Outlying Counties Committee.....	67, 73
District Commissions:	
Agricultural Workers Commission.....	67, 71
Legislative Commission.....	67, 71
Negro Commission.....	67, 71
Peace Commission.....	67, 71
Trade Union Commission.....	67, 71
Youth Commission.....	67, 71
District Conventions and Conferences:	
Founding Convention, April 1957, San Francisco.....	65, 66
Convention, First Session, November 1959, Oakland,	
Calif.....	65, 68, 72
Convention, Second Session, February 1960.....	65, 68, 73
East Bay Region.....	66, 73
Humboldt County Section.....	66
Marin County Section.....	66

**Communist Party of the United States of America (CPUSA)—Continued**  
**Districts—Continued**

<b>Northern California District—Continued</b>	<b>Page</b>
Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley Section .....	66, 68, 70
San Joaquin County Club .....	65, 68-71
Section Committee .....	70, 73
Executive Board or Committee .....	65, 68, 70, 71
Stockton cell or club .....	65, 68, 70, 72
San Francisco County .....	66
Santa Clara-Santa Cruz-San Mateo Counties Section .....	66
Sonoma County Section .....	66
Southern California District .....	50, 63, 66, 69, 83
<b>States and Territories:</b>	
California .....	66, 68, 69
State Committee .....	66, 70
State convention, First Session, January 19-20, 1957, Los Angeles, Calif. ....	65, 66
State Convention, Second Session, February 1957, San Francisco, Calif. ....	65, 66
State Disciplinary Committee .....	65
Communist Party, Soviet Union .....	31
Institute of Scientific Atheism .....	31
Communist Party U.S.A. (Marxist-Leninist) (CPUSA-ML) .....	58, 59, 61, 88
Community Alert Patrol .....	61
Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) .....	53, 55, 85
Bronx chapter .....	56
Congress of Unrepresented People .....	60, 62
Czechoslovakia, Government of:	
Embassy, Washington, D.C. ....	11, 12

**D**

DCA. (*See* W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America.)

**F**

Fair Play for Cuba Committee .....	83
Fellowship of Reconciliation (Chicago, Ill.) .....	83
Fifth Avenue Peace Parade Committee. ( <i>See</i> Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee.)	
Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee (also known as Fifth Avenue Peace Parade Committee) .....	82
Free Speech Movement .....	82
Freedom for the People Committee .....	59
Freedom Now Committee .....	61, 62
Freedom Now Party .....	53, 56

**G**

GRU. ( <i>See</i> entry under Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Government of, Defense (War), Ministry of, Army.)	
German-American Bund .....	75, 76

**H**

Harlem Defense Council (HDC) ( <i>see also</i> Progressive Labor Movement) ..	54
Hurok Attractions, Inc. ....	16, 17

**I**

IBM (Corporation) .....	9
IUC. ( <i>See</i> Inter-University Committee for Debate on Foreign Policy.)	
Independent Progressive Party (California). ( <i>See</i> Progressive Party, California.)	
Inter-University Committee for Debate on Foreign Policy (IUC) .....	83

**K**

KGB. ( <i>See</i> entry under Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Government of, Secret Police.)	
---	--

## vii

## L

	Page
Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, International (ILWU).....	84
Los Angeles Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.....	60
Los Angeles Police Department.....	61

## M

Marxism Discussion Group.....	58
Mau Mau Society.....	58
Military Order of the World Wars.....	22

## N

NAACP. ( <i>See</i> National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.)	
NOI. ( <i>See</i> Nation of Islam.)	
Nation of Islam (NOI) (also known as Muslim Mosque, Inc., and Black Muslims).....	53, 61, 77
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP).....	37, 65, 68
National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc.....	28
National Lawyers Guild.....	84
National Socialist White People's Party ( <i>see also</i> American Nazi Party).....	77
National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution.....	20
National Urban League, Inc.....	38, 39
National Woman's Christian Temperance Union (WCTU).....	22
New Left.....	79, 80
November 8 Mobilization Committee for Peace in Vietnam, for Human Rights, and for Economic Justice. ( <i>See also</i> Spring Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam.).....	82, 86

## O

Organization for Black Power.....	53
Organization of Afro-American Unity.....	89
Original Knights of the Ku Klux Klan	
States:	
Louisiana.....	90

## P

PLM. ( <i>See</i> Progressive Labor Movement (or Party).)	
PLP. ( <i>See</i> Progressive Labor Movement (or Party).)	
POC. ( <i>See</i> Provisional Organizing Committee to Reconstitute the Marxist-Leninist Communist Party U.S.A.)	
Peace Action Council.....	50
People's Armed Defense Groups.....	59
Progressive Labor Movement (PLM) (or Party (PLP)).....	53-58, 61, 62, 88
Harlem branch or chapter.....	53
Harlem Progressive Labor Club.....	54
Lower East Side Club.....	56, 61, 63, 79, 80, 82, 84
Progressive Party.....	65
California (Independent Progressive Party).....	64, 65
Provisional Organizing Committee to Reconstitute the Marxist-Leninist Communist Party U.S.A. (POC).....	58-60

## R

RAM. ( <i>See</i> Revolutionary Action Movement.)	
REP. ( <i>See</i> Students for a Democratic Society, Radical Education Project.)	
Radical Education Project. ( <i>See</i> entry under Students for a Democratic Society.)	
Religious Society of Friends:	
American Friends Service Committee (AFSC).....	72
Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM).....	47, 53, 56, 57

## S

SACB. ( <i>See</i> United States Government, Subversive Activities Control Board.)	
SCEF. ( <i>See</i> Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc.)	
SCLC. ( <i>See</i> Southern Christian Leadership Conference.)	
SDS. ( <i>See</i> Students for a Democratic Society.)	

SLANT. ( <i>See Self Leadership for All Nationalities Today.</i> )	
SMC. ( <i>See Student Mobilization Committee.</i> )	
SNCC. ( <i>See Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.</i> )	
SNICK. ( <i>See Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.</i> )	
SSOC. ( <i>See Southern Student Organizing Committee.</i> )	
SWP. ( <i>See Socialist Workers Party.</i> )	
Self Leadership for All Nationalities Today (SLANT).....	62
Silver Shirts.....	76
Socialist Party.....	59, 60
Socialist Workers Party (SWP).....	53, 59, 60, 63, 66, 80, 82-84, 88
Society of Automotive Engineers.....	7
South Side Citizens Defense Committee.....	60, 62
Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC).....	81, 86
Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc. (SCEF).....	53
Southern Student Organizing Committee (SSOC).....	53
Spartacist League.....	53
Sperry Gyroscope.....	9
Spring Mobilization Committee. ( <i>See Spring Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam.</i> )	
Spring Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam ( <i>see also November 8 Mobilization Committee for Peace in Vietnam, for Human Rights, and for Economic Justice</i> ).....	81, 83-89
Student Mobilization Committee (SMC).....	81, 82, 85, 86
Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (also known as SNCC and SNICK).....	53, 58, 81, 85
Students for a Democratic Society (SDS).....	59, 79-81, 85
City College of the City of New York chapter.....	82
March on Washington, April 17, 1965.....	80
National Convention, June 1965, near Kewadin, Mich.....	80
Radical Education Project (REP).....	80

## T

Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, International Brotherhood of.....	71
Trans-American Machinery and Equipment Corporation.....	7
Tri-Line Offset Co. Inc.....	53

## U

U.N. ( <i>See United Nations.</i> )	
UNICEF. ( <i>See United Nations, International Children's Emergency Fund.</i> )	
US.....	62
Underground. ( <i>See entry under United Klans of America, S.C. Realm.</i> )	
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Government of:	
Consulates:	
Washington, D.C.....	4
Defense (War), Ministry of:	
Army:	
GRU (Military Intelligence).....	5
Embassies:	
Mexico.....	17
Washington, D.C.....	4, 5, 7
Secret Police:	
KGB (Komitet Gosudarstvennoi Bezopasnosti-Committee for State Security).....	5, 16, 18
United Klans of America, Inc., Knights of the Ku Klux Klan (UKA).....	89, 90
Whiteman's Defense Fund.....	91
State Organizations:	
Georgia Realm.....	90
Clayton County Klavern No. 52:	
White Band.....	90
South Carolina Realm.....	90
Underground.....	90
United Nations (U.N.).....	10
International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF).....	8, 10
United States Government:	
Commerce, Department of.....	38
Commission on Government Security (Wright Commission).....	21, 26



	Page
Defense, Department of.....	38
Army, Department of the.....	44
Navy, Department of the:	
Office of Naval Research.....	45
House of Representatives, United States:	
Special Committee on Un-American Activities.....	75, 76
Justice Department.....	21, 22
Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI).....	4, 9-11, 15, 64, 67, 70
Senate, United States:	
Committee on the Judiciary:	
Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee (Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws).....	20
State Department.....	10, 12, 14, 15, 27
Bureau of European Affairs:	
Office of Eastern European Affairs.....	14
Passport Office.....	10, 11
Subversive Activities Control Board (SACB).....	19-30, 67, 73
Supreme Court.....	21, 23, 26-28, 30, 49, 51, 67, 73, 99, 100

## V

VFW. (See Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.)	
Vare Industries.....	9
Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States (VFW).....	23
Sixty-seventh National Convention, August 1966, New York.....	23, 24
Vietnam Day Committee.....	83

## W

WCTU. (See National Woman's Christian Temperance Union.)	
W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America (DCA).....	27, 53, 60-63, 78-80, 83, 85
Los Angeles, Calif.....	59, 61
National Assembly of Youth for Jobs, August 27-28, 1966, Washington, D.C.....	79
State University College of New York, New Paltz.....	82
WIDF. (See Women's International Democratic Federation.)	
WWP. (See Workers World Party.)	
Watts Action Committee.....	59
Watts Council for Equal Rights.....	60
Westminster Neighborhood Association.....	62
White Band. (See entry under United Klans of America, Ga. Realm, Clayton County Klavern No. 52.)	
White Knights of the Ku Klux Klan (Mississippi).....	92
Organizational Structure:	
Klan Bureau of Investigation.....	90
Whiteman's Defense Fund. (See entry under United Klans of America.)	
Women for Peace. (See Women's International Strike for Peace.)	
Women's International Democratic Federation (WIDF).....	82
Fifth World Congress of Women, Moscow, 1963.....	82
Women's International Strike for Peace (formerly known as Women Strike for Peace, Women for Peace, Women Stand for Peace).....	82
Berkeley, Calif.....	82
Worker's International Book Store.....	59
Workers World Party (WWP).....	53
Youth Against War and Fascism (YAWF).....	53

## Y

YAWF. (See entry under Workers World Party, Youth Against War and Fascism.)	
YSA. (See Young Socialist Alliance.)	
Young Communist League, Soviet Union (Komsomol)	
Fifteenth Congress, May 19, 1966, Moscow.....	80
Young Socialist Alliance (YSA).....	59, 60, 79, 80, 83, 84

x

PUBLICATIONS

	Page
<b>B</b>	
Big Lie, The (pamphlet).....	49
<b>C</b>	
Challenge (newspaper).....	54, 55, 82, 83
Combating Subversively Manipulated Civil Disturbances.....	42
Communist of the Armed Forces (Communist Party journal).....	35
Communist Party—A Manual on Organization, The (J. Peters).....	51
Crusader, The.....	47
<b>D</b>	
Dimensions (W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America journal).....	78, 79
<b>F</b>	
Freedomways (magazine).....	53
<b>H</b>	
High Temperature Inorganic Coatings (John Huminik, Jr.) (book).....	3
<b>I</b>	
Izvestia.....	7, 15
<b>L</b>	
Liberation.....	83
Liberator (magazine).....	53
<b>M</b>	
MacBird (play).....	88
Manual on Organization. (See Communist Party—A Manual on Organization, The.)	
Militant, The.....	82
<b>N</b>	
National Guardian.....	81
<b>P</b>	
Painters, The (article).....	15
People's Voice.....	59
People's World.....	65, 66, 71, 73, 83, 88
Political Affairs.....	65
Progressive Labor (magazine).....	54
<b>R</b>	
Ramparts.....	83, 89
Red Flag.....	59
<b>S</b>	
Student Mobilizer, The.....	82, 84
<b>U</b>	
Union Signal (WCTU organ).....	22
<b>V</b>	
Vietnam Courier (newspaper).....	51
<b>W</b>	
Worker, The.....	80
<b>Y</b>	
Young Bolshevik (official Soviet organ).....	31